

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XXXV.—NOVEMBER, 1881.

DR. MARTINEAU ON "LOSS AND GAIN IN
RECENT THEOLOGY."*

THIS publication of Dr. Martineau has had a somewhat singular origin ; but its significance is still greater. It marks a period in the history of Unitarianism ; and though its author is, we believe, mistaken in thinking that it marks a similar period in other Churches, his utterances are at least such as they may all lay to heart. No one who knows the career and writings of Dr. Martineau but will speak of him personally with respect, and, so far as his works protest against the current materialism of the age, with admiration ; but it hardly needs to be said that on Christian theology his views and anticipations are "wide as the poles asunder" from those of *The Catholic Presbyterian*. It is with the more interest, therefore, that we notice this publication in such a journal.

It has been the custom, it appears, in the Manchester New College, London, with which Dr. Martineau has for forty years (1840-1880) been connected, and during the latter portion of them as Principal, to hold a valedictory service at the end of the five or six years' study, which marks the transition of each group of students from academic to public life. A leading feature in this service has been an address by the Principal, suitable to the commencement of a religious ministry. This year an occurrence, which is doubtless exceptional, seemed likely to defeat the custom, as no students were prepared to go forth, at the close of their preparations, to the Unitarian ministry. In these circumstances, Dr. Martineau's old pupils, to the number of forty-five, joined in a request to him to hold the usual service, and to address them, engaged as many if not all of them had been in the work of the ministry throughout the country, on such topics as might be suitable to so unwonted a meeting. It is this address, accordingly, under the above title, delivered (23rd June, 1881) in Little Portland Street Chapel,

* London, 1881. Williams & Norgate.

VOL. VI.—NO. XXXV.

Y

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

that lies before us ; and naturally it has something of the character of a manifesto in regard to Unitarian belief, as also of a valedictory utterance after lengthened professorial labours of which the end is felt to be near. It is impossible to read without sympathy the personal references which Dr. Martineau makes ; nor did the beauty and charm of his style ever appear to greater advantage. At the same time, the prevailing feeling which his statement must make on those who radically disagree—as we do—with his point of view, must be one of sadness, and even of wonder that the present state of theology should be so regarded as it is here described. This is a matter which reaches wider circles than those which are here introduced to us as sustaining ties so intimate and cordial, and commemorated in language so graceful and pathetic ; and with all just regard alike for Dr. Martineau and his audience, we take the liberty of examining his leading positions, so far as his summing up not only affects the Unitarian creed, but also professes to reflect generally “recent theology.” We, however, wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not charge Dr. Martineau with identifying the changes in the Unitarian position which he signalises with corresponding changes in the Christian Church at large. It is only when he speaks of the atmosphere of recent thought as somehow lying all around the Unitarian camping-place that we think he tends to confusion ; and this is aggravated by using the general and far-reaching expression on his title-page, “Recent Theology.”

Limiting ourselves, then, in the first instance, to the Unitarian region, where the “loss and gain” are accepted at least by Dr. Martineau’s requisitionists as fairly stated, the changes of position are undoubtedly very great. Sentences like the following would have startled preceding generations who believed Christianity indeed to include a well-established Deism, but also to overtop it by a positive revelation denied to other religions, and found its voucher of eternal life in the miracle of the Resurrection :—“Instruments of persuasion, once too ready to our hand, have become unavailable. We have overstrained, perhaps, the search for final causes, and made providences out of trifles. Or, we have tried to reach the Creator by dating the beginning of the world ; or to establish a monopoly of revelation by maligning the great heathen religions and philosophies ; or to extort a proof of eternal life from the records of Christ’s resurrection. In the first humiliation of such mistakes, it is natural to feel helpless and alarmed” (p. 9). Still more explicit and serious are the disappearances from Unitarian theology, two of which Dr. Martineau announces, and to which, under the name of gains, he seeks to reconcile his hearers, or perhaps rather to rejoice with them, as already reconciled.

The first of these is the “total disappearance from our branch of the Reformed Churches of all *External Authority* in matters of religion” (p. 9). “The yoke of the Bible follows the yoke of the Church. The phrases which we have heard repeated with enthusiasm, that ‘the Bible, and the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,' that 'Scripture is the rule of faith and practice,' are indeed full of historical interest; but for minds at once sincere and exact have lost their magic power. I need not remind you how innocently and how inevitably this has come about; how completely the conception of a *canonical* literature [the italics are nowhere ours] that shall for ever serve as a Divine statute-book belongs to a stage of culture that has passed away" (pp. 9, 10). "The time is past when a doctrine could save itself from criticism by taking refuge under an apostle's word, or a futurity authenticate itself by a prophet's forecast, or a habit become obligatory by evangelical example" (p. 10). "To our function as witnesses for Divine things, this seems at first a disastrous change, little short of a loss of both the credentials and instructions which legitimate our message" (p. 10). "Are we then to despair of our office, because what was once used as a Divine text-book has become a human literature?" (p. 10).

Without touching as yet on Dr. Martineau's assertion that this apparent loss is really "a noble, though severe, advantage," it is important to remark how completely his admission bears out the whole contention of writers of the school opposite to his in the so-called Socinian controversy, that the tendency of Unitarian doctrine and criticism was to abrogate the authority of Scripture, and to reduce it to the level of human literature. This allegation was vehemently resisted in their day by the Polish brethren, who often put on Scripture a non-natural sense rather than seem to evade its authority; and in more recent times by Priestley, and Belsham, and other controversialists. It will be remembered that in the earnest debate between Moses Stuart and Channing on the Trinity, the former urged the latter, by the example of continental rationalism, no longer to profess unlimited submission to Scripture, but to escape insuperable critical difficulties which arose on his side, by openly denying its claims to be a judge in controversy. Now the contention of the orthodox is admitted. The step has been taken; and no one now, in arguing with Dr. Martineau or any of his brethren, needs to adduce a text, a chapter, a book, or even the whole Bible, more than the writings of Plato or Cicero, since external authority in religion is at an end. Those who wish to retain a Bible, see with what difficulty on Dr. Martineau's line of battle it is retained; and those who strive, on the other hand, to abridge the Divine side of the Bible to the exalting of the human, are warned in what extinction of Divine prerogatives this may issue. Can we say that Dr. Martineau's sum-total as to Scripture is more than Deism? It is not up to the standard of the *Protestanten-Verein*, "*Gottes Wort ist in der Bibel; die Bibel aber ist nicht Gottes Wort.*" This new Unitarianism does not even leave a *Gottes Wort* in the Bible more than in any other book. It is not a question how much of the *canonical* is to be retained, hunted out, and exhibited as the minimum—limited, but distinguishable—of God-given Scripture; for the Scripture, as such—the revealed,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

as such—is lost in the flood of all useful religious thought and literature.

But how, now, does Dr. Martineau reconcile himself to this loss, and turn it into a gain? Chiefly by this thought, that in being withdrawn from Scripture we are brought directly into contact with God in nature; are centralised, not in reflections of God, but in God Himself; and are placed “under the quickening touch of the Infinite thought, and righteousness, and love” (p. 12). He seems to think that these influences of nature are greater than any of so-called Scripture. “It is the *unwritten* oracles of God that have most deeply stirred the hearts of the devout; the beauty of the heavens and of the earth, the secret heroism of duty, the mystery of sorrow, the solemnity of death; and Scripture itself is only so far the “Word of God” as it truly plants us face to face with these His *silences*. It moves us, because it reads their significance as we read them ourselves, and would speak to us in vain were not the same faiths and affections already implicitly there” (p. 13).

We read these words with deep sadness, because they reveal the radical difference between Unitarianism and ordinary Christianity. To the Unitarian, God in nature is more than God in Christ. A human being, however exalted, makes no such step in the progression of things as to break nature’s silences. To connect with his advent, or with his recorded words, or general influence, anything that can be put on a level with creation or ordinary providence, far less represented as the sum and centre of them, as the solution of their enigmas or the redress of their discords, is incredible and almost monstrous. Whereas, to the ordinary Christian—who learns from Scripture that Christ is the maker of the heavens and the earth, which are but the reflection of His glory; that the “secret heroism of duty” finds its transcendent example, “the mystery of sorrow” its consummation and cure, in His atoning sacrifice; and that the “solemnity of death” is transfigured by His cross and resurrection into glory and immortality—it is absolutely impossible to regard nature, or history, or the unwritten oracles of God as equal to the voice of His incarnate Son, or to go back to their silences where He has spoken. It is a great confirmation of the ordinary Christian faith that, embracing as it does a revelation, taking up nature but transcending it, and filling its blanks with matter so stupendous, it justifies the Bible itself in so exalting its own importance, and justifies Christ in making Himself of so much consequence—“I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” Dr. Martineau, not having this to lose, can regard the loss of revelation with more equanimity; but it is with sorrow that we see him making the shipwreck smaller by first “casting out the wheat into the sea.”

Dr. Martineau, among other consolations, pleads that he and his party have only come to the position of the Friends, who dispense with authority in their use of Holy Scripture. “Our attitude towards Holy Scripture thus becomes the same which has long been familiar to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

the Society of Friends; simply assuming that the Spirit of God, which in the old time wrought these elements of sanctity into the pages of the Bible, lives and operates for ever in the human soul, renewing the light of Divine truth and kindling eternal aspirations, so that the day of Pentecost is never past, and there is still a tongue of fire for every evangelist" (p. 13). We truly believe that a greater misrepresentation of the views of any religious body has never been made than is here done, of course, unconsciously. If Dr. Martineau simply means that the Friends believe in the continued work of the Holy Spirit, so that all Christians as truly partake His influence as the inspired men of old, this is what all sections of the Christian Church hold along with them; though neither the Friends nor other Christians identify the inspiring, with the saving and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. If he means that the Friends hold some doctrine as to inward light, which may look special to themselves, then, even if this were granted, it would in no wise identify them with Dr. Martineau and his views; for this is not a power of judging of Scripture or overruling it, such as Dr. Martineau contends for, but of recognising it as what it claims to be, or, at most, of widening its revelations, so that beyond the range of written Scripture there is an unwritten revelation ministered by the Holy Spirit. So far as recognising Scripture by an inward experience goes, the Friends are hardly different from other Christians, or only in degree; and Dr. Martineau has expressly allowed that the Puritan theology—and the same thing is equally true of modern evangelical theology at large—only regarded the authority of Scripture as sufficiently recognised when it was recognised by an inward experience. But this was a totally different thing from founding its authority on inward light, witness, or capacity; for the authority must first be there, in order to be recognised.

How completely Dr. Martineau has misjudged the doctrine of the Society of Friends, we shall now show from a volume lying before us, and entitled, "Extracts from the Minutes and Letters of the Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, held in London, from its First Institution to the Present Time, relating to Christian Doctrine, Practice, and Discipline. Fourth Edition. London, Friends' Book Depository, 1864." This publication, which contains minutes and letters from 1672 onward, and which was first edited from MSS. in 1782, strikes, even in the preface to the edition of 1864, a very different key-note as to Scripture from Dr. Martineau. "Under the conviction that all sound Christian practice must be based upon the unchangeable truth of the Gospel of our Holy Redeemer, it has been thought right to commence the work with a chapter on 'Christian Doctrine,' consisting of extracts from documents issued at different periods on behalf of the Society." On the first pages is an epistle from George Fox and others to the Governor of Barbadoes in 1671. After setting forth the doctrines of Christ's Deity and sacrifice, the letter thus speaks of Scripture: "And

as concerning the Holy Scriptures, we do believe that they were given forth by the Holy Spirit of God, through holy men of God, who (as the Scripture itself declares, 2 Pet. i. 21) 'spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.'

Again, from the "General Epistle, 1836," "which is entirely occupied with the doctrine regarding Holy Scripture," we take these weighty sentences: "Often as our religious Society has declared its belief in the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and upheld the sacred volume as the only Divinely-authorised record of the doctrines of true religion, we believe it right, at this time, to revive some important declarations of Scripture itself on the subject." Then, after quoting 2 Pet. i. 21; John xx. 31; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Rom. xv. 4; John x. 35, these words follow: "In conformity with these principles it has ever been, and still is, the belief of the Society of Friends, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God; that, therefore, the declarations contained in them rest on the authority of God Himself, and there can be no appeal from them to any other authority whatsoever; that they are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus; being the appointed means of making known to us the blessed truths of Christianity; that they are the only Divinely-authorised record of the doctrines which we are bound as Christians to believe, and of the moral principles which are to regulate our actions; that no doctrine which is not contained in them can be required of any one to be believed as an article of faith; that whatsoever any man says or does which is contrary to the Scriptures, though under profession of the immediate guidance of the Spirit, must be reckoned and accounted a mere delusion." "We think it right plainly to declare that we have never acknowledged any principle of spiritual light, life, or holiness inherent by nature in the mind of man. Like our early Friends, we believe in no principle whatsoever of spiritual light, life, or holiness, except the influence of the Holy Spirit of God, bestowed on mankind in various measures and degrees through Jesus Christ our Lord" (p. 14-16). Again, "It is a distinguishing feature of the work of the Holy Spirit that it bears an effectual witness to Christ, and brings to the enjoyment of His grace" (p. 23).

We close this series with the words from the last General Epistle, that of 1861: "The gift of the Spirit is a special promise of the New Covenant. The Saviour expressly declared, 'I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.' The light that shines into man's heart is not of man, and must ever be distinguished both from the conscience which it enlightens, and from the natural faculty of reason, which, when unsubjected to its holy influence is in the things of God very foolishness. One with the Father and with the Son, the Holy Spirit works for the regeneration of fallen and rebellious man" (p. 25).

From these extracts, our readers will judge whether a greater mistake

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

was ever committed than in identifying the Friends' doctrine of Scripture and of man's just relation to it, with one which denies it all canonical authority; reduces it from "a Divine text-book" to "human literature;" and, exalting the "unwritten oracles of God" above any that can be written, leaves no such inspired "rule of faith and practice" or "Gospel of salvation" wherewith the Spirit may work on the heart, as the Friends testify He does. Nor can Dr. Martineau's account of His working when he says that "He lives and operates for ever in the human soul, renewing the light of Divine truth, and kindling eternal aspirations,"—but not connecting this, as they do, with a "witness to Christ"—be brought into any conceivable harmony with the Friends' doctrine and that of evangelical Christendom as to a "second birth" and a "new creation" in Christ Jesus.

This leads us to the second object which has disappeared, or fallen like a misleading meteor, from the Unitarian horizon, "the entire Messianic theology." This statement is so important that we give it in Dr. Martineau's own words:—

"I speak not merely of the lost 'argument from prophecy' now melted away by the better understanding of the Hebrew writings, or of the interior relation, under any aspect, of the Old Testament and the New; but the total discharge from our religious conceptions of that central Jewish dream which was always asking, 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another,' and of all its stages, its drama, and its scenery. It no longer satisfies us to say that Jesus realised the Divine promise in a sense far transcending the national preconception, and revealed at last the real meaning of the spirit which spake in Isaiah. Such forced conforming of the Jewish ideal to the Christian facts, by glorifying the one and theorising on the other, was inevitable to the first disciples, and could not but colour all that they remembered, and thought, and wrote; and the imagination of Christendom, working with indiscriminating faith on these mixed materials, has drawn upon its walls a series of sacred pictures, from which art has loved to reproduce whatever is tender and sublime, and which have broken silence in the Divina Comedia, in the Paradise Lost and Regained, in plaintive passion music, and the kindling popular hymn. . . . As objective reality, as a faithful representation of our invisible and ideal universe, it is gone from us, gone therefore from our interior religion, and become an outside mythology. From the person of Jesus, for instance, everything *official*, attached to him by evangelists or divines, has fallen away; when they put such false robes upon him, they were but leading him to death. The pomp of royal lineage and fulfilled prediction, the prerogatives of King, of Priest, of Judge, the advent with retinue of angels on the clouds of heaven, are to us mere deforming investitures, misplaced like court-dresses on "the spirits of the just;" and he is simply the Divine flower of humanity, blossoming after ages of spiritual growth—the realised possibility of life in God. And if he is *this*, he has no consciously exceptional part to play, but only to *be* what he is, to follow the momentary love, to do and say what the hour may bring, to be quiet under the sorrows which pity and purity incur, and die away in the prayer of inextinguishable trust; and to see him thus, we go to his native fields and the village homes of Galilee, and the roads of Samaria, and the streets and courts of Jerusalem, where the griefs and wrongs of the time bruised him, and brought out the sublime fragrance of his spirit. All that has been added to that real historic scene, the angels that hang around his birth, and the fiend that tempts his youth; the dignities that await his future,—the throne, the trumpet, the great

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

assize, the bar of judgment, with all the apocalyptic splendours and terrors that ensue,—Hades and the Crystal sea; Paradise and the Infernal gulf; nay, the very boundary walls of the Kosmic panorama that contains these things, have for us utterly melted away, and left us amid the infinite space and silent stars" (p. 13-15).

Such is the void before which Dr. Martineau stands; and how does he fill it, and again convert the loss into a gain? It is as before, by going back "to the intuitions and pieties of our nature; by His identification with which it is that Christ wins us as His disciples, and makes us one with Himself and with God" (p. 20). We understand by this the natural piety, which Christ, standing in the same relation with us to God, exemplified. This Dr. Martineau thinks is the whole meaning and true spring of any "Serious Call" which any one in youth has received, and which is wholly independent of imaginative and scenic elements, such as are now discarded. "In youth, if we ever receive a *Serious Call*, it is the most elementary religious truths by which the mind becomes entranced. Who can ever forget the intense and lofty years when first the real communion of the living God—the same God that received the cries of Gethsemane and Calvary—and the Sanctity of the inward Law, and the sublime contents of life on both sides of death, broke in a flood of glory upon his mind, and spread the world before him, stripped of his surface illusions, and with its Diviner essence cleared?" (pp. 18, 19). While thus interdicting imagination from "setting up the unreal by exhibiting it as visible," which is, according to him, the error of the "Messianic mythology," Dr. Martineau consoles himself by finding a true function of imagination left, which is "to decipher the real, though invisible." It is only due to him to state how he makes this bear on the life of Christ. "It finds for us all the hidden truth, of which the physical world supplies only the *symbols* to the eye,—the power behind all phenomena, the meaning of every expression, the feeling within every tone, the secret spring of every character. It reproduces for us the figures of the past, the theatre of their history, and the passions that moved them across the stage. It is the fountain of sympathy, by carrying us to the heart of joys and sorrows other than our own; and of hope, by showing lights of possibility beyond the darkness of the actual; and according as the Gospels are interpreted without or with its aid, the person of the 'Son of man' emerges as that of a Jewish compound of enthusiast and charlatan, or as the Head of a divine humanity. In the support which it affords to spiritual apprehension, it reads the finite into the infinite; its action is expansive, and its result an ascent into immeasurable truth. But in the invention of a mythology, it reads the infinite into the finite; its action is contractile, and its result a descent into puerile fable" (pp. 19, 20).

Having thus endeavoured to do justice to Dr. Martineau's position, we shall make on it these observations:—

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

(1.) *It illustrates the justice of past criticism on Unitarian tendencies.* Every one knows how official the Christ of Socinus looks. The principal treatise of that writer is entitled "De Servatore;" and he holds that Christ's atoning work, in the true sense of it, is now going on by His intercession and influence in heaven. As Dorner has said, this has actually a Romish look, Christ's one nature receiving the same exaltation with the Virgin and the saints. Crellius and the Polish brethren follow, explaining, in their own comparatively high sense, texts of Scripture bearing on Christ's offices as prophet, priest, and king. That Jesus is the Messiah is to Lardner the centre of Christianity, and Jesus is to him Intercessor and Judge. In our own century, Dr. Pye Smith, in his "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," debated the question of our Lord's person with Unitarians, who accepted the title of Messiah as a point included in their common creed, and covered with it an unexampled office and dignity. But all along, the orthodox contended that the word and conception as contained in Scripture, were too high for the Unitarian theology, and only belonged to their own side. At length, not so much these reasonings, as the tendencies of things have prevailed; and the Messianic idea, and all that pertains to it, is relegated to the domain of mythology. It may be that the humanitarian position thus gains in consistency; but does it not lose in historical continuity, and in the surmise that, as the orthodox have been in the right as to the true genius of Unitarianism in respect of the authority of Scripture and the Messiahship of Jesus, they may also prove to be in what remains of the controversy?

2. *Dr. Martineau's position runs up into inconsistency with all credible records of Christ's life and history.* Dr. Martineau has not said whether Jesus Himself participated in the error as to His Messiahship, which was "inevitable to the first disciples, and could not but colour all that they remembered, and thought, and wrote" (p. 14). This question, it is well known, has been a real *crux* to the later leaders of the negative school in Germany who wish to think as favourably of Jesus as possible, and, while denying Him all but human attributes, to absolve Him from all superstition, and fanaticism, as well as personal assumption, such as the very idea of a Messiah seems to involve. They came to this difficulty about the same time with the later Unitarians, for the earlier Rationalists, Paulus, Hase, and others, swallowed the scruple with the same readiness as the earlier English humanitarians. Of this struggle we see an instructive example in Strauss's "Leben Jesu," and not least in the difference between the editions of 1835 and 1864; for in the latter the effort to detach Jesus from all extravagant claims and pretensions, such as arise from the Messianic assumption, is much greater than in the former, and yet Jesus, according to the inexorable testimony of the evangelists, remains covered with a very unwelcome halo, such as surrounds the idea of coming in the clouds of heaven, and other delusions. In the most recent of Strauss's works, his "Old

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

and New Faith," all this is deepened ; and while the uncertainty of the Gospel records is more loudly complained of than ever, so as to give Jesus the benefit of the doubt, the irrationality and wildness of such anticipations, if Jesus really cherished them, is more bitterly lamented and condemned. How then does Dr. Martineau stand affected to these difficulties, which press upon his construction of the life of Christ, as truly as upon that of Strauss ? The Messianic mythology is discharged ; but is every blot and shade upon the character of Jesus discharged with it ? Does it not run through the whole Gospels, synoptic as well as Johannine, from the sermon on the mount to the trial before the high-priest, in utterances by and to the disciples, by the woman of Samaria, and the persons healed, as well as in the titles, "Son of God" and "Son of Man," and the ever-recurring "Kingdom of Heaven ?" Truly, if there is nothing Messianic in Christ's teaching as it truly was, and nothing official in His advent and work, the evangelists are the greatest of all blunderers, and the best of teachers has taught His scholars the least to understand and report Him. By what miracle of criticism does Dr. Martineau solve these perplexities, which on the same basis of a human Christ, Strauss has given up in despair ? He speaks of following Jesus "to his native fields and the village homes of Galilee," and other spots, to track "that real historic scene ;" but how much of it then is history, and how much mythology ? If the very axis of the history, according to the apparent meaning and purpose of the chief actor, is a mistake on His part, how is He to be vindicated ? If the mistake is on the part of His disciples, how is the rest of their scheme to be accepted and to hang together ? Is it too much to say that Dr. Martineau here needs all the imagination, which he makes the chief interpreter of history ; but even imagination cannot make the same writers credible and incredible by turns ; and if Jesus was so wonderful a personality as to call forth, even involuntarily, not the imagination which rises "into immeasurable truth," but that which sinks "into puerile fable," is not this very like the light that leads astray being light from heaven ? The question of the extraction of the life of Christ from the Gospels is one with which Dr. Martineau, with all of us, has to deal ; and it remains for him either to admit that Christ's teaching was Messianic, without lowering His character, or to deny it, without lowering, not merely the canonicity, but the whole historic worth and use of the evangelists.

3. The last remark we make is, that *Dr. Martineau's denials seem incompatible with the Unitarianism which remains.* Every one knows how highly in his writings generally he speaks of Christ. At this we rejoice, and, so far from wishing him to descend, we hope and pray that he may go up higher. It would be easy to quote from his other works, but as this last is certainly representative of his present views, we appeal to it. Here, then, he speaks of Christ as the "Divine flower of humanity," "the realised possibility of life in God," "the Head of a divine

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

humanity." Is there in this nothing Messianic, nothing official? If Dr. Martineau means, as we trust he does, here to assert the absolute sinless perfection of Jesus, did not so enormous an advantage in a sinful world bring with it corresponding relations and responsibilities? Could Christ on such a theory merely live like one of us, "with no consciously exceptional part to play?" The orthodox theory is here perfectly consistent, that a truly Divine being in human nature must have exceptional work—redemption, deliverance—all his own; and unless Dr. Martineau reduce Christ below sinlessness, the same law must so far apply. The recorded words of such a perfect man—not to go above this—would be, with such light within, in a true sense canonical; His mission, though not in our sense Messianic, would be a heralding, a disclosing of, a preparing for One greater than he; and there would be room for the belief—first as a surmise, and then as a conviction—that this stupendous moral miracle might be, actually was, the token and result of one beyond all conception greater—the union in him of God and man! Such a discovery, through sinlessness rising towards and revealing Deity, was made once and again in other days. Is it unkind or unbefitting a paper like this, to hope that Dr. Martineau may find too, that a sinless Christ must have a mission, and one which He can only fulfil by being in one the perfect man and the Incarnate God?

No time remains to consider the relation of the charges set forth in the Unitarian body to other denominations, so as to justify in any way the title "Recent Theology." We sincerely believe that, beyond the Broad Church tendencies in some Churches, there is no movement towards the goal at which Unitarianism is said to have arrived. It would be wrong to underrate the dangers of Broad-Churchism, and not least because to a large extent it wants that openness and courage which every one, even amidst the greatest differences, must respect in Dr. Martineau. Still, it is anything but the dominant power it is so willing to assert; and this has been proved in three cases which belong to "recent theology."

In the General Synod of the United Church of Prussia, in 1879, representing 7000 congregations, the so-called orthodox party outnumbered both the moderately orthodox and the unorthodox (the latter of whom roughly correspond to the Unitarians) taken together; this latter not being nearly a third of the whole representatives, and the proportion, too, less than in former days. In the Presbyterian Alliance Meeting in Philadelphia, in 1880, representing the whole Presbyterian world, the utterances were comparatively few that had even a Broad Church sound, and the manifestations of opinion by the Assembly on such questions as Inspiration, and the Atonement of Christ, could not be mistaken. And now in the great Ecumenical Conference of Methodism in London in this year, no one, we imagine, will find any "recent theology" of the type here proclaimed. Many

speak of siftings and shakings, but when results come to be tabulated, the faith of centuries still keeps the field.

We willingly close with a passage from Dr. Martineau, with which we largely agree, and which, coming from him, may have more weight with those whose watchword is progress, and only progress.

"Religion is reproached with not being *progressive*; it makes amends by being *imperishable*. The enduring element in our humanity is not in the doctrines which we consciously elaborate, but in the faiths, which unconsciously dispose of us, and never slumber but to wake again. What treatise on sin, what philosophy of retribution is as fresh as the fifty-first Psalm? What scientific theory has lasted like the Lord's Prayer? If it is an evidence of *movement*, that in a library no books become sooner obsolete than books of science, it is no less a mark of *stability* that poetry and religious literature survive, and even ultimate philosophies seldom die but to rise again. These, and with them the kindred services of devotion, are the expression of aspirations and faiths which for ever cry out for interpreters and guides. And in proportion as you carry your appeal to those deepest seats of our nature, you not only reach the firmest ground, but touch accordant notes in every heart, so that the response turns out a harmony" (pp. 20, 21).

JOHN CAIRNS.

SENSATIONAL PREACHING.*

A SHORT time ago, I read a statement which may serve to introduce the subject of this paper. The congregation of a distinguished living clergyman of this country, on one occasion became greatly excited by the preacher's theme and manner. His church was about to become the theatre of a scene not unlike that which, it is said, attended the first delivery of Massillon's sermon on the "Small Number of the Elect." Men and women wept audibly; and the crowded congregation bent forward as one person toward the preacher, who seemed to hold their feelings at his command. But scarcely had the tide of feeling reached this unusual height, when suddenly he checked his discourse, and, in a tone as calm as he could summon, said substantially, "Excitement like this does not become the house of God." Nor did he proceed with his sermon, until the members of the congregation had resumed the control of their feelings, or, to use the common but expressive phrase, had regained "self-possession."

This incident brings before us a Christian orator, not only unwilling to strive after a particular kind of power, but refusing to go forward with his oration from the moment that he sees he is wielding it. Whether by intuition, or after careful investigation—by some process at all events—he has reached the conclusion that "sensational preaching" will benefit neither himself nor his people. Even if we disagree with this conclusion, we must regard his conduct as highly honourable.

* A paper read before the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Philadelphia.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

He is an orator in the immediate exercise of tremendous power over his audience. His will determines their cries or laughter, their joy or sorrow. The congregation is a passive, but highly sensitive instrument before him, of which if he but smite the keys, it will return the appropriate note or chord. But he refuses; and says, "I dare not go on. This is not the place for such an exhibition." This certainly is self-sacrifice; and, as certainly, self-sacrifice from lofty considerations. For what considerations not lofty can be conceived of as moving him? It is difficult to believe that a man is led by low or selfish motives, when he denies himself the pleasure which low and selfish men covet most of all—the pleasure growing out of the exercise of power over their fellow-men. And what pleasure is more enticing than that which springs from power of the very kind which this preacher was then wielding so obviously, and in a measure so exceptional?

The frequent use of the phrase "Sensational Preaching" would seem to indicate that the method or type of preaching which the phrase designates is becoming quite common; at least, that the tendency of preaching is towards the sensational type. This tendency good men usually lament and condemn. If, however, you should ask them to state the grounds of their condemnation, they would find it difficult to formulate them. The sensational preacher is distrusted by good men instinctively, more often than after reflection and for reasons. It may not be obligatory on the laity to investigate the sources of their instinctive distrust, but we of the profession ought to know precisely what the phrase "sensational preaching" imports. I shall, first, describe sensational preaching, and, secondly, state its evils.

Let me begin with the statement that the preacher is an orator; as distinguished from the essayist, the poet, and the dramatist. The four may be comprehended in a single class; because all are engaged in the exhibition of truth by means of language. Some writers would call them *artists*, as enjoying that free play of faculty which distinguishes the artist from the restricted workman. Adopting the name, without justifying it, it will be noticed that they are widely separated from the painter, the sculptor, the architect, and musician, by the instrument which they employ. These latter use dead matter, which they fashion into form, or blend in harmonious colour, or arrange so as to evoke tuneful sounds; while the former employ written language or articulate speech. Now, language is the symbol of *thought*; and we may therefore call the essayist, the orator, the poet, and the dramatist intellectual artists, to distinguish them from the other four, who are sensuous artists. The products of the intellectual arts arrange themselves in two groups. In one group are the (philosophical) essay and the (imaginative) poem. In the other are the oration and the drama. They are separated by the fact that the essay and the poem are marked by the simple unfolding of *the truth*;—in the essay, to satisfy the understanding; in the poem, to satisfy the imagination. The essay is the

philosophic, the poem is the imaginative development of truth. Neither the essay nor the poem contemplates distinctly an *audience*; a mind other than that of the essayist or poet. On the other hand, the *dramatist* and the *orator* have always in view their respective *audiences*. Their products are shaped by the influence they desire to exert on those they address. It is the *audience* that determines the difference between the historical plays of Shakespeare and Hume's philosophical "History of England." The poet will employ the detailed simile in illustration to please himself; the orator, the bold metaphor to strike his audience. The essayist will use the elaborated syllogism in argument to satisfy his theme; the orator, the swift enthymeme. Hence, as Theremin is at great pains to show, you cannot make either the imaginative or the philosophic development of truth the fundamental, the all-important thing in oratory. This development of truth must give way to something more important in the orator. Development of truth is an important element, but it is not that element that ultimately determines the form of the oration: the prime factor is the audience. To make this clear, he proposes a question. "Is not, it may be objected, this profound and powerful development of ideas, which is the essential element in the philosophical representation, itself also the most infallible means of making an entrance for these ideas into the minds of others, and thus of fulfilling all the requisites of eloquence? Let one make this attempt, but let him make it with thoroughness, without suffering himself to be diverted by circumstances from the purpose once fixed upon. Let him lose himself entirely in the idea; let him develop it in its whole compass; let him not omit even the least of all that can serve to exhibit it still more clearly; let him forget, as is fitting, the place where he stands; let him confine himself to no definite time, but speak until his subject is exhausted; let him not trouble himself about his hearers, about the degree of their culture, about their capabilities, qualities, prejudices, inclinations; in a word, let him seek only to express his own mind. Will such a discourse be adapted to gain over an opposing mind, and to transfer the sentiments of the orator to his hearers? I think not. Hence no one, who refers the rhetorical or oratorical manner and method to the philosophical, is able in his practice to remain true to his theory. Imperceptibly he concedes something to the time, the place, the occasion, and the hearers; and thus there arises a product which is neither philosophical nor oratorical, and which can satisfy no one who is accustomed to judge of things with strictness."*

We have, then, the drama and the oration in a single class, separated from the essay and the poem by the fact that they imply an audience, and by the additional fact that the influence they intend to exert on this audience determines their form.

But are the drama and the oration essentially the same product? or

* "Theremin's Elements of Rhetoric," translated by W. G. T. Shedd, D.D., pp. 61, 62.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

is there a difference in their respective impacts on the audience? What is this specific difference, if any exists?

I reply, that the *drama*, by *representation* of past action, excites the *feelings*, for the purpose of promoting *enjoyment*; and the *oration*, by the *development* of truth, moves the *will*, for the purpose of securing *action*. The end of the drama is enjoyment; the end of the oration is action. The drama addresses the feelings; the oration addresses the will of the audience. The point, on which for the purpose of this paper it is important to seize, is that in the representations of the drama, however much the feelings of the audience may be in sympathy with the actor, the wills of the audience are in perfect repose, utterly passive. So true is this, that were the will to act in sympathy with the feelings, the situation would become ludicrous, and the propriety of the occasion would be violated. To make this clear, let us suppose the subject dramatised to be the life of Demosthenes. Demosthenes is delivering his first great Philippic. The purpose of the dramatist is, by representation, to call forth in the audience the same feelings that were called forth at Athens by Demosthenes by his oration. He intends that the audience shall feel what the Athenians felt; that their hearts shall throb and their pulses quicken; but with this difference: that whereas Demosthenes aroused the *wills* of the Athenians to action, so that they cried, "Let us march against Philip," the dramatist means that the wills of the audience shall be quiet. But suppose that one of the audience should be so completely under the spell of the illusion that, in addition to the excitement of his feelings, there should be also the arousal of his will; and he should cry out, "Let us march against Philip." The theatre would be in an uproar of laughter. And why? It was not intended that the whole man should be affected. It was intended that the feelings should be aroused, and the will, the characteristic thing in man, should be unmoved. The separation, then, of the feelings, the sensibilities, from the voluntary power in man, for the purpose of affecting the former alone, is the characteristic purpose of dramatic representation. On the other hand, the orator has action in view; never emotion, except as associated with a movement of the will. I am happy to quote, in confirmation of this view, the words of the late President James Marsh, of Burlington (Vermont) University, whose brief tract on "Eloquence" is one of the finest papers on that subject I have met with. "The work of the dramatist," says Dr. Marsh, "is professedly ideal, and we require of him, as the condition of submitting to the effects which he would produce, only a dramatic probability, and a harmony and unity of parts conformable to the natural and necessary principles of the act. He does not ask us to awake and believe; but if he performs these conditions, we voluntarily surrender ourselves to illusion, and indulge in a waking dream. We suffer his magic power to transport us now to Athens, and now to Thebes, and to stir up every emotion of our souls for the pleasure with which he repays us. *But then, in this case, our judg-*

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.

ment is all the time behind the curtain, ready to awake us at the first motion of our will."*

Now, as the name imports, the characteristic of *sensational* preaching is, that it is an address distinctly to the *feelings* by means of vivid *representation*. The sensational preacher, in so far as he is sensational, addresses the part of man that the dramatist addresses. His point of attack is the sensibilities. The danger arising from his method is, that he will convert his oration into a drama; that his power will be the power of the actor rather than the power of the orator; that he will represent vividly instead of speaking eloquently, and, as a result, will excite the feelings without arousing the will.

Thus we have reached the *idea* of sensational preaching. And now, the question arises—and it is a pertinent one—whether this idea is ever thoroughly realised? When we discuss the realisation of ideas, we are in a region of fact; we must talk not positively, but in terms of comparison; and must apply the adjectives "more and less." Of course, some preachers more often and more thoroughly employ the method of exciting the sensation than others do. But the ground which this paper takes is, that there is danger in the method. And to speak definitely, there is this danger, namely, that the will and the emotions will be separated; that the latter will be active, and will have the similitude of voluntary and lofty religious feeling, while the will will remain utterly quiet. This is carrying the sermon from the category of the oration over to that of the drama.

Just this is the popular conception of the sensational preacher. It will scarcely be denied that the phrases "sensational preaching" and "dramatic" or "theatrical preaching" are used interchangeably. The interchange is fair. Whether we inspect the movement of the mind in sensational preaching, or whether we observe those classed as sensational preachers, we find that the popular definition is correct. I do sensational preachers no injustice when I say, that they exhibit a power the same in kind as that, not of Webster or Burke, but of Booth or Fechter.

This is the secret of the *popularity* of this method of preaching. There is a positive pleasure in having one's feelings harrowed by painful sights and sounds, if only one's will is not obliged to act in correspondence with them. Let me be able to separate feeling from the central action of my soul, and I shall enjoy my tears. Hence, the paradox is true—a man will *enjoy* a tragedy in the proportion in which it is *tragic*. The more *blood*, and *fire*, and *deluge*, the louder screams and the deeper groans you put into it, the more you harrow his feelings, the more he will *enjoy* it, if all the while his will can be quiet; if all the while he can feel that his will need not move forth in self-sacrifice and good works. Hence, the drama has always been popular with people whatever their character. Perhaps it has been most popular with the worst

* "Memoirs and Remains of James Marsh, D.D.," Boston, p. 621.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

people ; for they have been able to air their good sentiments by means of it, without being forced to any corresponding movement of the will. I do not hesitate to assert that in the same fact lies the reason of the popularity of the sensational preacher. He excites the sensibilities, and leaves the will quiet and passive. Men go to hear him in order to have their feelings harrowed, and to enjoy the harrowing.

And thus we are brought into the presence of its chief, but by no means its sole evil. If a minister finds, however popular he may be, that he has adopted a mode of preaching which, while it enkindles the sensibilities of people, leaves them still untouched at the will, he ought to do what the preacher to whom I referred did—he ought to *stop*. And he ought to pray for deliverance from that mode of preaching, as he would pray for deliverance from a wile of the devil. There is not a more dangerous thing to a lofty religious life than sensibility divorced from the will. Coleridge long ago accurately described it in that great work, which I wish we all knew by heart, “Aids to Reflection.” In his introduction to the moral and religious aphorisms, he has occasion to distinguish sensibility from both prudence and morality. The whole essay is profound and pertinent to our theme. I quote from him, therefore, at some length : “Sensibility, a constitutional quickness of sympathy with pain and pleasure, and a keen sense of the gratifications that accompany social intercourse, mutual endearments and reciprocal preferences, must not be mistaken for morality or even prudence, or be deemed a substitute for either. It is not even a sure pledge of a good heart, though among the most common meanings of that many-meaning and too commonly misapplied expression. So far from being morality, it ought not to be placed even in the same rank with prudence ; for prudence is at least an offspring of the understanding. But sensibility is for the greater part a quality of nerves, and a result of individual bodily temperament. Moreover, prudence is an active principle, and implies a sacrifice of self, though it be a sacrifice to the same self, projected, as it were, to a distance. But the very term sensibility marks its passive nature, and proves little more than the coincidence or contagion of pleasurable or painful feelings. Thus sensibility prompts men to remove those evils alone, which, by hideous spectacle or clamorous outcry, are present to their senses, and disturb their selfish enjoyments. Provided the dung-hill is not before their own parlour window, they are well contented to know that it exists, perhaps as the hot-bed from which their own luxuries are reared. Sensibility is not necessarily benevolence at all, but by rendering us tremblingly alive to trifling misfortunes, it frequently prevents benevolence, and induces an effeminate selfishness instead, pampering the coward heart with feelings all too delicate for use.

“ Sweet are the tears, that from a Howard’s eye
Drop on the cheek of one he lifts from earth ;
And he who works me good with unmoved face
Does it but half ; he chills me while he aids.

But even this, this cold benevolence
 Seems worth, seems manhood, when there rise before me
 The sluggard pity's vision-weaving tribe,
 Who sigh for wretchedness yet shun the wretched ;
 Nursing, in some delicious solitude,
 Their dainty loves and slothful sympathies."

It is because the great tendency of sensational preaching is to this "selfish," "dainty," "delicious," and "slothful" excitement of the sensibilities that it ought to be regarded as one of the worst evils that can possibly befall the Church.

Nor is this all. If its influence on the Church is evil, its influence on the preacher is quite as bad. For its tendency is to make him at bottom an untruthful man. I do not now refer to the fact—though that also is important—that when the preacher moves away from oratory to the drama, he moves from the region of living fact and eternal truth to that of past event and evanescent feeling ; but to something very different. Let me have distinctly in view the arousal of another's will to moral action, and I shall be careful of my own will. But let me have in view the excitement of another's feelings, and my scruples will abate. The excitement of the sensibilities being my object, I will not content myself with the statement and enforcement of truth ; I will paint in broader hues and in more glaring contrasts ; I will change positive into superlative adjectives ; I will exaggerate. Let me not give names in this paper ; but I know that I have heard good people—ministers—tell anecdotes for the purpose of exciting the feelings, with a detail of circumstance, and a minuteness and length of dialogue, as both in substance and in form correct, which it would have been impossible for them to hold in their minds. Becoming actors for the purpose of exciting the feelings of their audiences, their veracity lost its bloom. And if a minister of the Gospel will swerve from the exact truth in the pulpit, where can he hope to be veracious ?

Moreover, I must believe that if sensational preaching shall become the rule, it will be a symptom of the general decay of religious life. I have shown the close affinity between this mode of preaching and the drama. The drama is a fictitious revival of the past. It is an endeavour to reproduce feelings in association with a representation of past action. But the feelings are only feelings, because the events are ended, and the will is not therefore summoned to action. Of course, sensational preaching could not be, if the feelings it awakens had not at one time been associated with spiritual action. But like the drama, it deals with the past. When it shall be the common mode, the Church will have reached its old age ; its life will be in the past, and it will be ready to die. It will be simply repeating the feelings of its own heroic ages, but divorced from their heroism of will and act. That period, to employ a figure drawn from our climate, will be the Indian summer of Christianity. There will be warmth indeed, and streams will flow again, and birds will renew their songs. But the trees will

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

put forth no leaves ; no harvest of good works and self-sacrifice will succeed it. These only will succeed it—winter, and frost, and death.*

To conclude. This brief opening of the subject may have started in some one's mind this question : Is the preacher of the Gospel not to address the feelings ? Must he, because of these dangers, be calm and cold, merely expository and argumentative ? Is there no place for feeling in preaching ? Is there no feeling to be excited in the audience ? This brings up the whole subject of the nature of religious feeling—a great subject, on which I offer but a single remark.

Whoever inspects man will observe the instructive fact, that the lower the feeling is, the more completely is it separated from the will. Take purely physical feeling. It has absolutely nothing to do with the will ; it is purely constitutional, utterly involuntary. Bruise your finger, and it is hurt. Your will has nothing whatever to do with the feeling of pain. So it is with the appetites of the body. Both the longing for food and the pleasure of eating are involuntary. So it is with the sentiments, and the pleasure of expressing them. Take ten men from the penitentiary and ten consistent members of your church. Let a great actor delineate the story of a great wrong before the twenty. The ten from the penitentiary will heave with indignation quite as quickly as the ten from the church ; for sensibility is constitutional and involuntary. This constitutional sensibility the actor plays upon. And because he makes men cry over a story of wrong, he calls his theatre "a school of morals." But the truth is, that all this play of the feelings has nothing to do with morality. The will is still inactive. The man cries without any choice of his own, and his tears flow whatever is his character. Even remorse is not a religious feeling, if by a religious feeling we mean one inherently praiseworthy. For it also is constitutional—involuntary. In remorse the man is passive ; and it possesses and stings him, though he would, if he could, destroy it.

But this is not the case with all feeling. There are voluntary emotions. These are the emotions which the elder psychologists included in the term *will*. They believed that in the realm of spirit, desiring and willing are one and indivisible. These active and voluntary feelings can be commanded. "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God ; thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*" This is the feeling which it is the mission of the preacher, as an orator, to co-operate with the Holy Spirit in calling forth. This only is religious feeling. But this feeling is religion in its very essence. It is the feeling of the will. The sensibilities are avenues through which these feelings may be reached. But they are only avenues ; and even as avenues they are by no means so important as the intellect. Truth, declared by the sacred orator and apprehended by the intellect of the hearer—not sights and sounds

* About mid-autumn in Canada and the United States, there are usually two or three weeks of the weather described above, and called Indian summer. It is as delicious as the British May ; but is followed by snow and ice.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

which excite the sensibilities,—is the means of grace most often selected by the Holy Spirit, to evoke that love to God and man, which is the characteristic life of the regenerate. Hence, I do not say that the preacher must not excite feeling. But I do say that he must take care that the ultimate feeling which he attempts to excite is not constitutional, but voluntary—not the feeling of *nature*, but the feeling of *character*. This is the one kind of emotion that can be called holy. But this is not only holy, it is holiness. This feeling carries martyrs to the stake. This feeling is the one adequate preparation for the enjoyment of the instant vision of the holy God.

JOHN DE WITT.

FROM LOG-CABIN TO THE WHITE HOUSE.*

THE interest connected with the tragical death of President Garfield was unprecedented, but we believe it would have been many times greater in trans-American countries had the public been more familiar with the early stages of his career. For ourselves, we find Mr. Garfield far nearer our heart, and his memory an object of far higher reverence since we read the volume whose title we give below, detailing the noble struggles and victories of his early life. But beyond this, we find the memoir, quaint and comical though it often is, so admirable as an exposition of high aims and lofty principles, of Christian convictions and Christ-like habits and feelings, that it becomes our duty to do our best to bring it under the notice of our readers, and especially of two very important classes in every community—young men, and working men. Mr. Garfield was not a Presbyterian, but in a case of this kind we leap over such secondary barriers; he was a Christian by conviction and deliberate choice; his noble example overshadows every smaller consideration, and makes his life and character the property of the whole Christian Church.

We must first give a cursory outline of his life, in order to make the brief commentary intelligible which we propose to offer upon it.

Some sixty years ago, one Abram Garfield, a descendant of English Puritans, having been seized with what was termed the "Ohio fever," left the State of New York to settle in the woodlands of Ohio. There he married Eliza Ballou, a descendant of a Huguenot refugee, and there, in a very rough log-cabin, his four children were born,—the youngest, James, on 19th November, 1831. One day in the midst of his hard

* From Log-Cabin to the White House; the Story of President Garfield's Life. By W. M. Thayer. London, 1881. [We take this book as we find it, but we cannot see how it is possible to regard many of the conversations as much better than imaginary. The facts, however, seem to rest on a solid basis, and it is the facts that constitute the great interest of the story.—ED.]

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

toil, he heard the alarm of "fire in the forest." Rushing to meet the enemy, he strove with giant energy to prevent the raging element from devouring his possessions. In the middle of a hot July day it was a terrible struggle, and though he triumphed, it was at the sacrifice of his life; he was seized with congestion of the throat, sank and died. It was a most trying situation for his poor wife. Bereft of an affectionate husband, with four children to care for, the oldest boy but ten, and the youngest eighteen months; with no means of living but what could be extracted by hard toil from the bit of ground that had been reclaimed, and on which there was a considerable debt; with winter close at hand, and so little food to carry the family over it, that, without starving herself, the mother could not feed the children,—any ordinary woman would have sunk down in despair. Mrs. Garfield fully realised the situation, but disdained to throw herself on the charity of her friends. She knelt down and besought the Husband of the widow to make her duty plain. And she rose with a lighter and easier heart. She and her boy Thomas would somehow manage the farm, finish the half-built barn, and complete the fence round the property. And so, by God's help, they did.

The family were wonderfully knit together under trials and difficulties that long seemed on the point of overwhelming them. They all thought what they could do, and they all did what they could. Thomas especially was a noble worker, and it was to him a delight, with his first money earnings, to buy a pair of shoes for the future President, who had not hitherto, even in the hard winter, had any covering for his feet. And when a winter school was opened and, at the age of three and a-half, "Jim" had to begin his education, but was unable to walk so far, his sister Mehetabel took him on her back, quite cheerful, as Mr. Thayer remarks, under the double burden of her brother and her awkward name. The Garfields had been members of a sect called "the Disciples," which seems to have originated in the days when new sects were formed for but slender reasons, and with this body Mr. Garfield continued to be connected to the end. James had an admirable Bible training at home, and with his wonderful memory he soon came to know his Bible well. There was not much preaching in the neighbourhood, so its religious life gathered round the Bible. He was restless, but wonderfully quick. But his regular school-days were short. At the age of eight he had to become a farm-labourer; and as he hardly ever knew what it was to say "I can't," there was no feasible task he did not grapple with. When he was twelve, his elder brother left for Michigan, and the charge of the farm devolved on Jim. It was characteristic of Thomas, that with his first earnings in Michigan, he returned and built a frame house for his mother. James was so active and self-reliant, that, besides working the farm, he contrived at odd hours and times to do other work, earning some dollars thereby, much to his mother's relief and delight. At twelve he could earn the wages of a man; and when, after a day's

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

absence, he placed no less than a hundred cents in his mother's hands, it is no wonder that the good woman felt a lump at her throat.

The thirst for education early took hold of him, and much of his extra work was performed to enable him in winter to have another turn at school. No kind of work seemed to come amiss to him. Once, through reading Captain Marryat's novels—a rare and almost accidental thing for him to do—he took a great fancy for the sea. And he went so far as to engage himself as a canal boy. But his experience there, and other considerations, weaned him from the sea. On one occasion, when he was ill, the words SCHOLAR and SAILOR seemed to hold the balance even. But the first prevailed. He made up his mind to be a scholar, and with him the making up his mind to a difficult pursuit implied the constant devotion of every energy to its attainment. To get a college education seemed at one time as impossible as to get to the moon. But with marvellous perseverance and energy he succeeded. He had always to be working at least double tides—toiling as a mechanic at odd hours, attending classes by day, and burning midnight oil. Only a man of the strongest constitution could have borne it. By-and-by he became qualified to act as occasional teacher, and that curtailed his mechanical toil. Having graduated at last at William's College, he became teacher in Hiram Academy—a school where he had got much of his education—and after a year he was made its Principal. His eminence as a speaker was great; and as he was a strong republican, and a great opponent of slavery, he soon got into the stream of politics, and in 1860 was elected a State senator. On the breaking out of the civil war, he joined the army, and rose rapidly to the rank of major-general, being equally conspicuous for activity, personal courage, and skill and tact in training and inspiring his troops. After the war, he became a conspicuous and influential member of Congress. And then, very unexpectedly, in 1880, when thirty-five ballots had been cast in vain at the Chicago Convention to determine who was to be the republican candidate for the presidency, the unanimous call of the Convention was given to Garfield. All know what followed—his election, his assassination, and his death.

Two very important events in his history happened while he was training himself to be a teacher. One winter, while he was teaching school near his mother's, there was a settled minister at the Disciples' meeting, a very earnest preacher, a devout Christian, and a man of strong native abilities. "He was just suited to interest a youth like James, and his preaching made a deep impression on him. From week to week that impression deepened, until he resolved to become a Christian at once, and he did. Before the close of his school he gave good evidence that he had become a true child of God. And now his mother's cup of joy was overflowing. She saw distinctly the way in which God had led him, and her gratitude was unbounded. James saw, too, how it was that his mother's prophecy was fulfilled (after a disappointment about a situation he had desired), 'Providence has something

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

better in store for you.' " Garfield is one of the ten thousand instances that attest the value of a godly, praying mother.

The other notable event in this period of young Garfield's history was his engagement and marriage to Miss Lucretia Rudolph. When this modest, talented, and prepossessing young lady first appeared as a pupil along with him at Geauga Academy, Garfield, who had never been much inclined before for girls' society, was unconsciously attracted by her. Not that he fell in love, but her scholarship, her diligence, and her abilities interested him. Afterwards, when he became a teacher at Hiram, he had her for a pupil in his Greek class, and subsequently in other classes too. The result was natural. He was twenty-two, and she twenty-one, and they became engaged. And this was the lady with whom we have all become so intimately acquainted during that long, weary, and distressing eleven weeks when her husband was hovering between life and death. This was the noble wife that could not believe that one whom Providence had so wonderfully guided to the position of President, and, as she knew well, qualified so eminently for the post, to whom he had given a brain to devise and a hand to execute plans of highest utility for his country, would be allowed to succumb, at the very threshold of his career, to the blow of a dastardly assassin. This was the woman to whom Queen Victoria sent such tender, sisterly messages, and who showed herself during the dark weeks when she was in the public eye so worthy to be the wife of so great a man. Now that she retires into the obscurity of widowhood, she carries with her the respect of the civilised world, as well as something infinitely more precious,—the blessing of Him who in the past hath been mindful of her, and who will bless her still.

1. The first thought that impresses us in the life of Garfield and his family is the blessing there is in a God-honouring ancestry. On the father's side he sprang from the Puritans, on the mother's side from the Huguenots. Nobler blood could not well have run in his veins. Nor was this a mere matter of sentiment: account for it as we may, the moral qualities of his ancestors seem to have come to enrich his character. The indomitable courage that no dangers could daunt, the perseverance that no toil could exhaust, the self-control and self-reliance that came out in bolder relief the more they were tried, all remind us of his God-fearing ancestry. And we seem to get a brighter glimpse of God's purpose in permitting those terrible persecutions to rage around His servants, which steeped their native lands in blood, and drove impoverished exiles to seek homes in foreign lands or across the seas. There was burnt in, as it were, into the very bone and soul of their race the spirit of noble endurance, of patient continuance in well-doing, of unextinguishable hope. Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake. As years roll on, it is found that the decrepitude, and the helplessness, and the despair are with the representatives of the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

persecutors ; and the energy, the strength, the might that asserts itself in conflict, the wisdom that triumphs over embarrassments, and the virtue that conquers enfeebling temptations, on the side of those whom they persecuted. This is one of the great compensations of Providence, and no effort of man's can neutralise it, or rob faithful witnesses of its help and final blessing.

2. Not less striking in Garfield's history is the influence of a well-conditioned Christian family. The father is dead, and the Christian mother is the ruling power. She is a struggling mother, but full of trust and prayer, she struggles calmly and hopefully, and the children see well that every energy of her nature, and every sacrifice of which she is capable, are devoted right cheerfully to their good. And so, by God's blessing, there is bred in them from earliest years a powerful sympathy and intense family affection. There is a wonderful unity in that poor log-house. There is no member of it but desires to take as little as possible from the comfort of the rest, and to contribute to it as much as he can. It is more blessed there to give than to receive. And as there is want and pressure, every one is set thinking what it is possible for him to do for the general interest. Mehetabel sees that she can carry Jim to school, and she does it. Thomas can work the farm, and he does it. In addition to her maternal duties, Mrs. Garfield is able to split logs, and she does it. It is a beautiful spectacle of family unity and affection. James Garfield grows up, loved and loving. Domestic sunshine falls on his heart, and it is reflected right joyously on the hearts of all around him. Here is his first treasure—affection received and affection bestowed. He is a rich boy even before he owns a pair of shoes.

3. It is a fine school for the spirit of self-reliance and self-control. All that can be done must be done, and done among themselves. For there is no outer world to look to, to do anything for them. James Garfield may not be able to determine beforehand all that he can do, but he knows one thing—whatever Tom did may be done by Jim, and he has no hesitation at Tom's age to step into Tom's shoes. His mother would say to him, "He who *wills* to do anything *will* do it. The boy who relies upon himself, and determines to perform a task in spite of difficulties, will accomplish his purpose. Feel that you are equal to the work in hand, and it will easily be done. 'God helps those who help themselves,' it is said, and I believe it. He has helped me wonderfully since your father died. I scarcely knew which way to turn when he died ; I scarcely saw how I could live here in the woods ; and yet I could find no way to get out of them and live. But just as soon as I fell back on God and myself, I took up the cross, and bore it easily. We have fared much better than I expected ; and it is because I was made to feel that where there's a will there's a way. God will bless all our efforts to do the best we can." Here is Christianity in its healthiest form,—trust in God and active effort going hand in hand together.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

Self-reliance pairs beautifully with self-control. A certain thing has to be done within a certain time, so that there is no time for self-indulgence and trifling. A man who always feels in need of all his energies will neither weaken them by indulgence, nor let them get into a fever through passion. Strong drink was unknown in the family of James Garfield. The great physical strength of the family was developed and maintained on a water beverage. With something of the power of a giant, he was always master of himself. He knew how to chastise the coward and the bully, yet not lose control of his temper. How this habit stood him in stead in after-life,—in the thick of battle, in the heat of debate, and on the weary sick-bed, where he lay so long under a mortal wound, all the world knows to-day. It would be well if all the world would ponder the road by which he reached the attainment.

4. The habit of doing his best for his family, carried out on a wider sphere, made him an excellent citizen. For the best citizen is he who feels that the State is a family on a wider scale, for whose advantage it is his duty to contribute all that he can. The bad citizen is he who has an interest separate from that of the State, and who, by fraud and treachery, by shoddy contracts, and by robbing the Egyptians in every manner of way, tries to increase his personal share of goods. Garfield would as soon have thought of robbing his mother and his sisters as of enriching himself at the expense of the State. There is no fear of any community whose sons are governed by such a feeling. There is little hope for any community where, as among self-seeking children, the aim of each is to draw as much to himself as he can. There is no community like the Christian family for educating such citizens. It is ridiculous to try to infuse such virtue by the mere study of history, or by lectures on political economy. Men of true public spirit are rarely to be met with who have not been brought, in a Christian home, under the influence of wider influences than those which bear on their immediate benefit. The family machinery, combined with the Christian spirit, is far the most efficient means of gendering such men. The great principle inculcated by Christ goes a long way to make men public-spirited—"The servant of all is the greatest of all: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

5. The qualities of which we have made mention might, however, have come to little, if James Garfield had not been led to personal decision for Christ. The other influences that worked on him affected but the shallower parts of his nature; his conversion to Christ touched the core. It was the result and crown of all that had gone before, and the bud and seed of all that was to come after. It brought him into loving fellowship with the source of all pure and beneficent influence, it elevated his aims, and dignified his whole life. It made him fearless and active in duty, and not less patient in tribulation. It invested his deathbed with its peculiar and very beautiful halo; it made him strong and

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

hopeful in battling with disease, yet patient and submissive to the will of God. At one time he was very near entering the ministry in the "Disciples'" church. He sometimes preached, and with great acceptance and power. When he was a teacher at Hiram, he was an active, working Christian. "He spoke and prayed in meeting; he urged the subject of religion upon the attention of his companions, privately as well as publicly; he seconded the religious efforts of the principal, and assisted him especially in the conduct of religious meetings. In short, the same earnest spirit pervaded his Christian life that had distinguished his secular career."

6. Another great factor in Garfield's career was his habit of resolutely making up his mind to work towards a given object. In his early years the most considerable instance of this habit was his determination to acquire a high education. He knew that it would occupy long, but even if it should have required a dozen of years, he was prepared to begin earnestly, and continue to the very end. There never was any wavering of purpose after his resolution was formed. Onward and onward he went—"always pegging away." Then his energies were never allowed to stagnate. There was always a force bearing him onward. Towards the ultimate goal he worked without ceasing, nor could he ever rest till the goal was won.

Such a life is full of encouragement to young men and to working men. No doubt, Garfield's was a peculiar case, both in the influences of his youth, and in the circumstances that placed him, before he was fifty, on the highest pinnacle of American honour. But that distinction came to him—it was not sought. And strictly speaking, none of his honours were sought, except the honour of being an educated man. Garfield was not ambitious in the worldly sense. He was ambitious in the sense of wishing the position that would enable him to make the most of his abilities for the benefit of others. In that sense, it were a good thing if all were ambitious in the last degree.

But men on the more common levels of natural ability and opportunity may still learn much from his career. See what is done by the purpose and habit of making the most of everything. See what comes of kindly consideration for the good of others. See what self-control and self-reliance can effect. Above all, see what comes of Christian decision and Christian faith. Garfield was a greater man than Franklin, because he had a higher faith and a stronger trust in the Unseen. We must not be told that he had wonderful luck. No man knew better what a subordinate place is due to the factor that the world calls luck. One of his earliest masters expressed Garfield's own view when he said to him, "Boys that depend on luck for a livelihood will go pretty hungry sometimes. I had rather a boy of mine would have a single ounce of pluck than a whole pound of luck. Luck is like an old United States bank bill, of very uncertain value; but pluck is good as gold all the time." If Garfield had continued a working man all his life, he would

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

have found in that sphere the surpassing value of his principles. If he had been a teacher to the end, they would have told marvellously on his teaching power. His becoming President, while it proved his eminent abilities, just showed on the highest level the value and efficacy of his principles as rules of life.

It is hard to understand the purpose of Providence in depriving fifty millions of people of so wise and good a ruler. May it be found, as in the case of David Livingstone, that the holy, chastening, yet stimulating influence of his death will accomplish more than could have been effected by him had he lived to the end of his days, and left his mark deep on the history of his time.

W. G. BLAIKIE.

THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

[The following paper ranks with the papers in the August number on "Presbyterian Worship—Does it need Reform?" It is a contribution to the general subject for which only the writer is responsible.—Ed.]

UNDER this head I propose briefly to consider some of the dangers which beset the Church of Scotland, some of the disadvantages under which she labours, and some of the measures whereby these dangers may be met, and these disadvantages counterbalanced. And I explain, at the outset, that by the Church of Scotland I mean the aggregate of the several bodies which are presbyterian in government, and whose creed is defined in the Westminster Confession. It is unnecessary to name these bodies to Scottish readers, and I do not wish gratuitously to flaunt our divisions before the eyes of others.

It is allowable on this occasion, and for my purpose, to consider the reformed bodies with a Presbyterian constitution as one Church. The rivalries which may exist among them do not affect any essential part of that Church system which is menaced specially in two directions, though in different degrees; menaced first, as every reformed system is, by the Roman Church; and secondly, by the Scottish Episcopal body. Other religious sects possessing a foothold in Scotland may be disregarded in this paper, as not seriously threatening the position and influence of the Scottish Church. The Congregational system, for instance, does not appear to present any attraction to the Scottish mind; its services and theology are not sufficiently different from our own to offer that of novelty; nor has it any of those accidental advantages which belong to the communions already singled out.

We say, first, the very attitude of the Roman Church threatens every reformed communion with which it is brought into contact. And in the case of the Church of Scotland, it is this general danger

which has to be recognised, rather than any specific peril arising from the relation in which the two communions stand to each other. It may, indeed, be doubted whether Romanism makes progress among the population of Scotland, apart from the Irish portion. It would seem as if a nation which has clung with such tenacity hitherto to the reformed system, must be far removed from the danger of again lapsing to Roman Catholicism. The breach at the Reformation was so thorough as to make any return or even approach to a system so widely different, so to speak, physically impossible. The Reformers tore away everything that could be instrumental as a medium of return, or even approach; they burnt their bridges behind them. Hence, the people of Scotland have not at any time seemed to hanker after compromise with Romanism, or in any way sought directly to undo the trenchant work of the Reformation. The Romish system is so different from ours, alike in its theology, its Church service, Church work, and the life and duties of its clergy, that direct comparison between the two is almost impossible. The two streams run parallel, but are as far from mingling as if a stone wall divided them; or, to change the metaphor, the lines are not continuous, no transference from one to the other can be effected by orderly sequence, or otherwise than by a violent wrench. And hence, save among the lowest and unreasoning classes, defections from the Scottish to the Romish system can take place in the case of individuals alone, and by a process of reaction rather than of logical advance. It may be observed further, that the Romish Church in Scotland does not possess much social prestige; motives of social advancement cannot enter into the calculation of persons contemplating a change of religion, however unworthy they may otherwise be.

It will thus be seen that the danger to which I consider the Church of Scotland to be exposed in especial is from the side of the Scottish Episcopal body. It may be instructive to consider in some detail the nature and causes of this danger: how far it is due to strength in the position of the rival body, how far to weakness in our own. And we shall be able subsequently to make some suggestions as to the means proper to fortify our own ecclesiastical position against such influences as may be found to run counter to it.

I shall begin by mentioning, in order to pass by, one claim on the part of the Scottish Episcopal body, which, if conceded, would constitute a point in its favour. I refer to its claim to catholicity; more particularly, to the aggressive side of that claim, in conformity with which the Scottish Church, as non-prelatic, &c., is regarded as outside the bounds of the Catholic Church. That the idea of catholicity is capable of forcibly arresting minds of great power, and equipped with intelligence and learning, is proved amply by what has taken place in the Church of England. It has been, indeed, the lever by which many have been transferred from the Anglican communion to that of Rome; and it is conceivable that a similar claim preferred by a High Church body

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

might work in similar fashion in Scotland. In point of fact, however, I believe that this claim, in so far as it is made, does not affect the Scottish mind, chiefly for two reasons. First, the course of ecclesiastical history in Scotland, the questions which have been forced on the attention of the Scottish people, and the manner in which these questions have come before it, have not served to bring the point prominently forward. The contrast between the Scottish and English Church is here very instructive. At the Reformation under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, and still more after the counter-Reformation under Laud and his successors, so much was left that was fitted to remind English churchmen of Rome and its ways; so much, in especial, survived of pre-Reformation usages and phraseology, that there have always been many persons in the Anglican communion who cherish a certain degree of tolerance for Romish ways; and again, there has always been room for persons, who began by adhering to the more drastic or Genevan side of the Reformation, to move towards the pre-Reformation position, without feeling themselves, or being considered by others, to be beyond the limits of loyal Anglicanism. In a word, it has been possible always, in the English Church, to proceed by continuous and delicate gradations from the thorough Protestantism of the first Reformation, to the Anglo-Catholicism, occasionally almost toppling over to Romanism, which was a not unfrequent development of the movement under Laud.

Applying this, we see how inevitable it was, that, possessing not only a professed and outwardly visible identity of foundation with the Roman Church, but a large body of common principles and usages, many of the ablest members of the English Church should have been concerned for its title to be part of the one Catholic Church; a title denied, of course, by Rome, but which the Anglican thought to assert more successfully by turning the cold shoulder to other reformed communions.

How different were the circumstances of the Scottish Church. From the first the breach with Rome was irrevocable, as has been said; and the counter-movement of 1638 was a return, with increased fervour, to principles which had been modified in the generation preceding. To the Scottish mind there has never appeared occasion for refuting the exclusive claims of Rome: so far as she and her pretensions are concerned, no practical need has existed for the vindication of her own claims by the Church of Scotland; and thus, in the second place, contented with the strength of her individual position—the strength of possession—she has been at little pains to frame or embody any theory of the Church. And her members, sharing her belief, have shared the vagueness of her views as to outside claims. Nevertheless, she has stood secure, and desires her people to stand secure, alike in possession of the place, and in succession to the functions of the pre-Reformation Church of Scotland.

Having thus eliminated its High Church claim from the advantages

which the Scottish Episcopal body may possess, we must hasten to enumerate and discuss some of those which are in varying degrees real and solid.

I. I select, to begin with, as being perhaps most obvious, the prestige enjoyed by the Scottish Episcopal body, despite its weakness in point of numbers, in virtue of the fact that its communion embraces the largest proportion of the upper classes of the country. This fact alone is of great importance. How it has come about might be an interesting inquiry; some of the reasons lie on the surface. But, in any case, the fact means wealth and influence out of proportion to numbers; it means social position for the clergy; and it must be owned as a danger, that certain sections of Scottish society, not composed, it may be, of persons the most worth preserving,—but all are worth retaining,—are attracted by this social superiority, and in some cases the attraction proves strong enough to induce a change of communion.

II. I shall adduce, in the second place, the prestige of another kind, but not less real, which arises from the ecclesiastical connection of the Scottish Episcopal Church with the powerful Church of England. It is not easy to overestimate the formidable nature of this circumstance. The degree of interchange, fellowship, and communion between the two Churches is on the increase, and tends more and more towards an organic connection. Many influences are at work, which conspire to this end. Not to trench on points hereafter to be noticed, I shall mention the increased communication between England and Scotland, the large influx of English visitors for considerable portions of the year, giving an air of outward importance and encouragement to congregations weak in their home membership and numbers. The cause of this growing connection between the two bodies is largely due to what we may place under a third head as—

III. The largely-increased activity of the Church of England, its enhanced and more universal Church feeling, evidenced, as we may notice in particular, by the devotion of its laity, and their willingness to spend large sums of money on its behalf. We may trace this influence extending to Scotland, and witnessed by the building of chapels in various places.

IV. I have anticipated in a single line a fourth point of great importance, the large dimensions to which intercourse between England and Scotland has attained. Here we touch a point in which the future, not of the Church alone, but of everything distinctively Scottish, is at stake. To realise the force of this consideration, we have but to think of the number of Scottish youths who are now educated at English schools, or schools conducted on the English system and under English Church influence. What may we expect as the sequel of this training in the case of a large proportion of boys undergoing it, members even of families which have adhered hitherto to the Scottish Church? Is it not obvious, at least, that the strength of their attachment to the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

Church of their fathers incurs a serious risk of being undermined? Under the same head we may class the flood of English influences of all kinds which is flowing northwards in continually increasing volume—in English books, journals, customs. In this view we may regard the Scottish Episcopal as the vanguard of the English Church, and see, in the pressure of all this on the Church of Scotland, but a wave of that general pressure of things English on things Scottish, which, whether to be regretted or not, is one of the marked features of our day, but which was perhaps contained implicitly in the Act of Union. I think no apology is needed for calling attention to this as constituting a dangerous menace to the Church of Scotland.

V. In the growing familiarity on the part of the Scottish public with things English, is included (and we must take particular notice of it) an acquaintance, more or less familiar, with the services of the English Church,—her mode of conducting public worship. These services, omitting extreme cases, are distinguished by perfect good taste, and exhibit in other ways much that is attractive to cultivated people. And they contrast in these respects with much in our mode of conducting public worship which cannot be described as attractive, and is not always in good taste. The English Church possesses the most admirable liturgy in existence, while the Scottish system, though capable of admirable effect, lies, in its actual development and application, at the mercy of one individual officiating minister.

VI. Public worship may be regarded as falling naturally into two parts—worship strictly denominated, consisting of praise and prayer, and preaching or teaching. At the present time the relative position of these two constituents seems to be undergoing a process of change. Preaching, once considered to be the strong point of the Scottish Church, is, to some extent, losing ground to the other parts of public worship, in which practically, whether or not in theory, we stand at some disadvantage. Reasons for this change are not far to seek; they have been very often stated, and it will be sufficient merely to instance the approach in point of education and culture on the part of the large body of sermon-hearing people to the clergy; the competition of religious and other journals, periodicals, &c., which impregnate the public with notions on religious subjects, and deprive pulpit addresses in some degree of freshness. While, on the other hand, prayer and praise, being matters of feeling, are not so much affected by varying degrees of education in the worshipper. Culture may, indeed, demand some change in the cast and language of prayer, and the musical clothing of praise; but they are the outward religious observances which men in our day cling to to the last. It is notorious that many persons continue to go to church for “the service,”—*i.e.*, the service of praise and prayer,—to whom the teaching part of public worship is indifferent or repugnant.

VII. Flowing in the same direction is the strong tide of æsthetic feeling which has been passing over the country during the past few

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

years. The Scotch are not an artistic people, but, though late, this tendency is at work in Scotland as elsewhere. People search for and obtain the beautiful in their private surroundings, and in their ordinary life. Now, at present, this is wanting in the environment of the Scottish Church, while it is found in that of the English. Those who do not possess architectural taste and knowledge may not be aware of what is well known to others, that many of our most recent fabrics fall far short, in taste and propriety, of the small chapels rising on every side, dedicated to worship according to the Anglican form, even when far more costly.

Our deficiencies under this head are in respect of—(a) church buildings; (b) outward decencies of church order; (c) music; (d) arrangement of the parts composing public worship, use of colloquialisms, &c.; (e) resulting in a general lack of *dignity* as a characteristic of our public services.

What I have to say on these points connects itself with our failure to make the most of what we possess. Bearing in mind the advantages enjoyed by the rival communion, we may note—

(1.) Our hazy views as to the theory of the Church. Though this primarily concerns the clergy and the instructed portion of the laity, yet in the end it affects the tone of the whole Church. We want a more vivid and dogmatic realisation of the fact that we are, by outward constitution, a portion of the Church universal. Failing to conceive this clearly,

(2.) We extend an easygoing toleration to Protestant bodies occupying the same ground as ourselves. We dispute points of their creed, ritual, government, &c., but we do not, as a Church, cherish a sufficiently acute sense that some of us must be living in schism. Our relations with bodies outside ourselves (and this remark applies to our own unhappy divisions, over which I cast a veil) are either not friendly enough, or not hostile enough. We have no keen longing for outward unity, no adequate sense of the sin and scandal of division.

(3.) We weaken our position by our internecine feuds, conducted, in too many cases, without that courtesy which should characterise the controversies of gentlemen.

(4.) In respect of our public services, we fail signally to make them the best of which the system is capable. Our ministers commonly fail to realise that our simple form of service, as it rejects ornament, must depend for its attractiveness on a character of quietude, dignity, and soberness being imparted to it. Yet, in point of fact, how often do we find ourselves at the mercy of individual caprice; or worse, vulgarity. In great measure this is due to the want of a skeleton rubric or liturgical direction, from which the officiating minister should not deviate. As has been said, the service depends for its dignity entirely on the individual minister; but his manner of performing the service is frequently most undignified. We have to lament habitual and distressing col-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

loquialisms, and to dread the effect of restlessness and uncertainty produced on the mind by ignorance even as to the order in which the various parts of the service are to be taken. It must be a common experience,—it certainly is the writer's,—to be irritated by the consciousness, which is not suffered to sleep, of being wholly at the mercy, for everything on which the outward attractiveness of the service depends, on the minister who happens to be officiating. And his desire must be shared by many, to have the *Church* reminding us of her existence by some degree of restraint put upon the caprice of her ministers—some *direction*, however unobtrusive, to emphasise the fact that we are members of a Church as well as of a congregation.

To descend a little to particulars, among the most common, most objectionable, and most easily remedied blemishes in the mode of conducting public worship are the following :—

(1.) Optional and colloquial forms of speech in giving out the several parts of the service.

(2.) The practice of reading out the psalm or hymn which is about to be sung. One is curious to know if anything can be said in defence of this practice. The practice of reading the *whole* of a psalm or hymn, and doling forth a verse or two to be sung, is, if possible, more offensive. No congregation will ever grudge the few minutes saved from reading, for singing a larger portion of the psalm or hymn.

(3.) The structure of the prayers. The question of extemporary prayer in public worship as against a liturgy, cannot be discussed here ; but this vital question is not involved in the avoidance of—

- (a.) Statements which are neither petition, confession, nor giving of thanks.
- (b.) Reflections on persons who ought to be, but are not, present.
- (c.) Expositions of doctrine.
- (d.) Intimations to the congregation, statistics, and the like.
- (e.) The many peculiar modulations of voice to which some ministers have recourse in addressing the Almighty.

There is no form of address in the hearing of which the ear and the mind alike are more sensitive, and hence critical, than public prayer. Surely, then, those who are charged with offering it, should be careful to purge language and voice of everything mean, bizarre, vulgar, and undignified.

Though briefly expressed, it is probably true that the more an extemporary prayer consists of citations from Scripture, the better is it, and the nearer to the ideal ; and worse in proportion to the degree in which the minister expatiates in his own language. And would that our clergy always remembered that public prayer is common prayer, and that the writhings of an individual soul should never be obtruded on a congregation.

I have said that it is desirable that the Church should speak to us in her public services. Let this be secured, even if it be only at the links,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

as it were, which join the several acts of worship. It is certainly not beyond the enacting power of the Church—the pressure of awakened public opinion would, indeed, suffice—to secure that the words introducing the successive portions of the service should be dignified and *uniform*.

The following sketch will serve to exhibit what is meant :—

- (1.) On his entrance into the pulpit, the minister shall say—
 Let us begin the public worship of God by singing to His praise in the ——.

[Corruptions of this form : “ We shall sing,” “ Join in singing,” “ Sing,” “ Unite with me in singing,” &c.]
- (2.) At the conclusion of psalm or hymn, the minister shall say—
 Let us pray.

[Corruptions : “ Let us join in prayer,” “ unite,” “ engage,” &c.]
- (3.) At the end of the prayer, the minister shall say—
 Let us read in the — chapter of — ;
 and at the close he shall say—
 May God bless the reading of His Holy Word.

[Corruptions : “ We shall read,” “ Read,” “ Join with me in reading,” “ Read a short passage.”]

These simple forms, which, if invariably observed, would impart to our services a character of order, soberness, and dignity, often unknown, supply what is needful towards introducing the parts of which public worship consists. One thing remains to be noticed—the *Benediction*. Is it too much to ask that this should be given always in *some* unadulterated Scriptural form ? Pronounced as it frequently is, the benediction presents serious aberrations from good taste. What, for instance, can excuse such mangling as this, which the writer has heard ?—“ May grace, mercy, &c., be on us, *and on all those dear to us.*” The memory of most readers will furnish other examples of the same sort of thing. Before passing from this point let me remark, what is in danger of being neglected by the younger generation of ministers, that it is the duty of the minister not merely to pray for the people, but to “ bless them in the name of the Lord ;” and that, therefore, the true form of benediction should not be shirked, as it often is, but should run, to adopt one apostolic form, “ The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.” The second Book of Discipline is quite explicit on this point (chap. iv. ¶ 8).

My object has been to show how, with the materials at hand, used in the plain Scottish form, a solemn and dignified service is within reach. The very simplicity of the means by which the result is to be attained warns us how greatly it is put in peril by slovenliness and obtrusive colloquiality. I have said nothing of other resources available to us whereby that service might be enriched. For example, it may be enriched by the unvarying use, at a given point of the service, of the Lord's Prayer, which, however, should stand alone, and not be tacked on,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

as it often is, to a florid extemporary strain, as if not good enough to be used by itself, nor sufficiently expressive of human wants without amplification. The Apostle's Creed, too, occupies a place among our standards, and might, with much effect, be recited by minister and people together. But changes of this sort, to be really useful, and for edification, should be prompted and caught up by spontaneous and inward movements on the Church's part, not merely as a bid for popularity.

Nor do I insist on the gradual and judicious introduction of the organ into our public services, without the assistance of which, however, I doubt whether any tolerable standard of congregational singing can be attained. By tolerable singing I mean such as shall have an effect pleasing to the ears of persons of cultivated musical taste (they alone can speak with any authority on this branch of the subject); and therefore anything but florid or pretentious. While personally I enjoy and enter into the spirit of a rich musical service, I believe that the simple monosyllabic tunes of the Scottish Psalter and other old collections, free alike from feebleness and vulgarity, best suit the genius of the Scottish form. On the other hand, I believe that some instrumental assistance, guiding and supporting the voice without overpowering it, would be less irreverent and distracting, as well as less vulgar, than the common usage of choir leaders—bowing, stamping, and swinging their arms, or giving the required emphasis by unseemly bawling.

The concluding and most delicate part of my subject remains, but I shall pass over it lightly. It concerns the bearing and demeanour of the clergy themselves in the pulpit and elsewhere. We are all familiar with eccentricities of manner and utterance, such as often compel us to feel how much more solid and lasting an impression would be produced on the occupants of seats in the church by a better manner, more subdued and solemn, acquired at the expense even of something in the sound and vigorous matter which often lies beneath. A great responsibility lies on all teachers of the rising ministry to avoid everything which can suggest or encourage imitation of peculiarities of voice or action.

That this imitation has been, and is, an evil in the Church, will not be denied. Let all those whom it concerns remember that the inevitable effect of eccentric, unpolished, or unconventional manners on the part of the clergy is to alienate numbers of well-disposed but cultivated people, whose relish for, or good disposition towards, evangelical teaching cannot penetrate the thick sheath of eccentric or vulgar utterance and uncouth gesture. Let them bear in mind the increase in the number of the intelligent and cultivated middle class, and their familiarity with a favourable social type of clergymen. The Scottish Church at the present time stands in danger of losing a large class of benevolent neutrals. It would be the extreme of folly not to seek by all means to retain and increase the number of this class in our midst. Towards

this end, let us mark the necessity, never more pressing than now, of maintaining the dignity and elevating the social tone of the clergy.

Of the considerations which have been urged, many, it may be said, if true at all, apply mainly to the case of the upper and upper-middle classes still remaining with us. To them, it may be, primarily; but, humanly speaking, without these classes there can be in our day no prosperous Church, or healthy Church work, or Church life. They are the large money-givers, the givers too, of social tone, the teaching classes, possessing educating power over those beneath, moulding the views and determining the attitude of large bodies in lower grades of society. But, apart from this, if the Church of Scotland believes in her mission and lives up to her name, she must recognise her duty by all legitimate means to regain what she has lost, to recall the upper classes, as well as to retain those whom she still possesses.

The Church of Scotland possesses her greatest source of strength in her generally powerful and Scriptural style of preaching. This great weapon, which won the Reformation battle, may need some furbishing; the phraseology of the pulpit may require to be brought nearer to the language of everyday serious life; more heed needs to be given to the ordinary temptations, duties, and difficulties of hearers; but the substance of preaching, in which the best product of the heart and intellect of an educated ministry is presented, can never fail to be, under God, the main bulwark and strength of any Church which has the happiness to possess it.

LIVERPOOL.

J. D. C.

THE GRAVE OF JOHN KNOX.

Knox's resting-place in Parliament Square, Edinburgh, near St. Giles' Church, is marked only by a small slab inserted in the pavement, and bearing the initials and date, "I. K. 1572." A few paces distant is an equestrian statue, erected to the memory of Charles II., and the visitor cannot forbear to wonder with what design the memorial of the Covenant breaker has been placed so as to overshadow the grave of him who made the National Covenant a possibility.

WHERE did they lay him?—In the lone churchyard
 Swept by the breezes of his native hills,
 Where tearful dew might keep the greensward fresh
 As loving hearts preserve his memory?—
 Where did they lay him?—Neath the shadowed arch
 Where light steals timidly, and footsteps sound
 Hollow and faint amid the pillared gloom?—
 Where did they lay him?—Where he ought to lie:
 Hard by the church whence oft his tempest voice
 Rung through the land the wak'ning call of truth.
 God's acre then, within the city's heart,
 Around the old cathedral reared its mound

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

Of human dust, but now 'tis swept away
 And edifice and square usurp its place.
 There once the grass luxuriant waved ; but now
 We tread a stony pavement and espy
 A flag of larger size, that marks the place
 Where lies John Knox, old Scotia's noblest son.
 Grave of the dauntless, who ne'er feared the face
 Of mortal man, I stand beside thee now
 Spot of all Scotland I most long'd to see !
 Thrill other hearts, ye battle-fields that speck
 The landscape of the storied north ; inflame,
 Ye sylvan glades and river-burnished scenes,
 With fire poetic and sweet gush of song
 Their breasts who tread the paths where poets trod.
 To me far dearer than the blood-soaked plain
 Or muse-frequented shade, this hallowed shrine
 Where Freedom's champion was laid to rest,
 His conflict ended and his victory won.

Bright through the darkness of a land enthralled
 In mental fetters, shone the faggot fires
 That lighted Hamilton's and Wishart's souls
 From earth to heaven, flashing, as they blazed,
 Across the sky the herald flush of dawn.
 But, when one prophet on the flaming car
 Wheeled to the glory, on another dropped
 His mantle ; so the martyr spirit fell
 On great John Knox, though not the martyr's crown.
 The times were stirring, plot and counterplot
 Harassed the realm into a seething tide
 Of vexed humanity ; but, as of old
 When in the porches lay the wistful crowd,
 The troubling time became the healing time.
 Long had Rome fettered in her chilling grip
 The free pulsations of man's lawful thought ;
 But truth had made the hearts of men rejoice,
 Speeding warm currents of celestial love
 Throughout the nation's veins ; and he who drank
 One draught of nectar from the fountain head
 Loathed the soul-poison of her green-scummed pool.
 Still the high places of the land were foul
 With rank stagnation, venting fœtid breath ;
 And these first motions of the new-born life
 Needed direction, that they might not lose
 Their force like rivers that the desert sucks.
 It was a time that called with piercing wail
 The cry of Macedon, "Come over ! help !"
 And he,—the priest emancipated, he—
 The galley slave set free,—the exile, heard,
 And to his native land John Knox returned.

THE GRAVE OF JOHN KNOX.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

His the clear mind to make the issue plain,
 His the high soul to dare the covert foe,
 His the fixed purpose, undeterred by fear,
 Unswayed by blandishment, unawed by power.
 His voice, more thrilling than a hundred trumps,
 Spake to men's souls the truth in honest words,
 That, clothed with potency by One Supreme,
 O'erturned the strongholds of a hoary fraud,
 Till the grim shackles centuries had forged
 Snapped like green with-bands, and the land was free!

Was free and is! Though sometimes through the air
 Uncertain murm'ring come foreboding ill.
 Scotland is sound, in spite of voices now,
 That utter slanting praise of those who bore
 The brunt of danger, in the storms of old.
 We, in the calm, may speak in mellow tones;
 Which, in their days, had never gained an ear.
 We mould words smoothly; but when hearts and brains
 Were cased in cuirass, and in plumed casque,
 Stern words were needed to find entrance there.
 O for a Knox to face the world to-day,
 And speak the truth that burns in timid hearts!
 We need the spirit of his noble life—
 We need the spirit of his fearless speech
 To smite the painted bigotries, that flaunt
 Revived deceptions in the eyes of men;
 To wake the shame vile customs rock to sleep,
 And preach the decalogue throughout the land.
 Not men, but systems, theories, and deeds,
 Would be his foes were he among us now,
 Whose dust reposes 'neath a city's tread.

Has he no monument? What statue there
 Invites the gaze that well may overlook
 This humble slab? That represents the king
 Who signed the Covenant to gain a crown.
 Yes! give the statue to the sceptred rake—
 To Knox a slab scarce worthy of a hind;
 It matters not, his tomb is grander far,
 Than ought that hands can fashion. 'Tis upreared
 Hard by the roadway of men's daily thoughts,
 And coming ages, fragrant with his fame,
 Shall swell the cairn with tributary praise;
 For, perfumed by the unguents of men's love,
 Swathed by the reverence of truth-freed souls,
 The memory of Knox has been embalmed
 In myriad hearts throughout the breathing world.
 But not in cold frigidity it lies—
 A mummy in a tomb of stone—it thrills

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

Each live sarcophagus with purposed thought,
That breasts the aimless currents of to-day,
And rears in action such a monument,
That earth is shadowed by the fame of Knox.

J. CUNNINGHAM M'CLUNG.

THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT: THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

II.

IN a previous article, we called the attention of our readers to the general subject of the changes made by the New Testament Revision Company on the Gospel of St. John. Only a small part of the task before us could then be overtaken, as it seemed desirable to select at least one portion of the Gospel, and to explain the grounds upon which the more trifling as well as the more important changes rest. In order to form a just estimate of the Revised New Testament as a whole, it is not enough to discuss those leading passages in which change at once strikes the eye. Even the most minute modifications of the Authorised Version must be studied with care and patience. Innumerable particulars worthy of regard will otherwise be left nearly, if not altogether, unnoticed; and no adequate idea will be gained of the anxious care that has been bestowed upon the work. The first chapter of St. John's Gospel thus claimed all the space that could be allowed to a single article.

We do not propose to proceed further in the same direction. It is obviously impossible to do so. The task would be almost endless, and we should have to accompany the Revisers upon a second ten years' voyage before we could hope to reach a port. What has been said on the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel must, therefore, serve as a sample of what might be said on its other chapters were they treated with similar minuteness; and we may be allowed to turn only to the greater alterations which the Revisers have introduced into the remaining chapters of the book. We have to think, not of the slighter changes, but of those that distinctly affect its meaning, either removing obscurities, or bringing out more clearly the main drift and purport of its lessons. Upon considerations of this kind, rather than upon those connected with a number of minute particulars, the popular estimate of the Revision will depend; and it ought never to be forgotten that, to whatever extent this estimate may be affected, and rightly affected, by the judgment of scholars, the Revisers make their ultimate appeal, not to scholars, but to the members of the community at large. By the degree to which the latter, not the former, accept or reject the Revised

New Testament, must it be pronounced a success or a failure. Our object, therefore, is now to take up the remaining chapters of the Gospel of St. John, and to look at such of the more important changes as it may be possible to speak of in the few pages at our command. Do they or do they not justify—so far as the changes of one book can justify—the general acceptance, and the public as well as the private use, of the work?

Beginning, then, with chap. ii., the first change calling for remark is that in ver. 11. The Authorised Version reads, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee." The Revisers have changed the word "miracles" into "signs." The change may be thought by many to be of no great consequence. In reality it is one of the most interesting and valuable of the book. The word thus translated "signs" occurs seventeen times in the Gospel of St. John. The translators of 1611 have rendered it in this way only four times out of the seventeen (chaps. ii. 18; iv. 48; vi. 30; xx. 30): on all other occasions, even in the immediate context of some of these passages, they have rendered it by "miracles." The Revisers have uniformly translated "signs." It was most important that they should do so. Not only is the word, although found in many passages of the earlier Gospels, plainly a characteristic word of St. John, but it is used by him in all the depth and intensity of its meaning. A sign is far more than a miracle. The latter may be simply a mark of power, testifying to a higher than human agency in the person by whom it is wrought. No miracle of the Gospels, indeed, is this alone; but when it is presented simply as a miracle, we may think of it in this light, and may regard it as no more than an appeal to the understanding, as an evidence that the worker is a commissioned messenger of God. We cannot think thus of a "sign." That word leads us directly to the inner nature of the miracle or act (for it is not necessarily a miracle) so designated. It is the outward expression of an inward spirit, that in which the spirit manifests itself, clothes itself, makes itself palpable to the eyes. All this might be abundantly proved, did our space permit, from the manner in which the word is used in the Old Testament, apart from the use of it in the New. We can only say that the facts are so, and that being so they throw a most instructive and valuable light upon the Gospel of St. John, and upon the manner in which the miraculous working of our Lord was conceived by that Evangelist. Miracles, then, are not so much the supernatural working of the Son of Man, as they are the natural working of Him who is Son of God as well as Son of Man. They are simply the "manifestation" of a Divine "glory" that is in Him, though veiled in His state of humiliation from the eye of sense. They illustrate the fact that in Him the Divine is in the human, what is above nature within nature; that in the power of that Divine life which He has introduced into the world, He has abolished the hard-and-fast boundary-line which we lay down between the supernatural and the natural; and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

that in Him (may we not say in His people also, according to their measure?—for they are one with Him) there is a real and true sense in which the natural is the supernatural, and the supernatural the natural. The rendering of which we speak is thus one of vast importance, and its importance is heightened by the fact that the Revisers have so consistently and so thoroughly carried it through the whole Gospel. It thus establishes itself as the bearer of a meaning which it could hardly acquire through isolated, even though numerous, examples of its use.

Chap. ii. affords, in ver. 17, another illustration of important change, "The zeal of thine house shall eat me up." The Authorised Version has, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." The change is dependent upon reading, and like so many changes proceeding from the same cause, is of high value. As commonly read, the words can only mean that the disciples beheld in the cleansing of the temple an act of that burning zeal for the glory of God by which our Lord was marked; as correctly read, they indicate that they beheld in it an earnest of that fate by which He would be overtaken. They did not see Him already eaten up, in a metaphorical sense, by His zeal. They saw rather that He would be really eaten up, really consumed by it; that such bold defiance of constituted authority and of popular following could, if continued, be followed by nothing but a tragic end. Ver. 22, indeed (in which it ought to be observed that the words, "the Scripture" refer to the quotation in ver. 17), seems to show that they did not perceive this fully at the moment. But even then they obtained a glimpse into the future darkness. Is there not importance in this? How often has it been objected to the fourth Gospel that in it Jesus beholds His approaching death too soon. But such foresight cannot have been introduced into the Gospel by the Evangelist for the purpose of magnifying his Lord, for in that case he would have confined the anticipation to Him alone.

Chaps. iii. and iv. present not a few changes interesting both in a dogmatic and a historical point of view, such as the substitution of the words "judged" and "judgment" for "condemned" and "condemnation" in chap. iii. 18, 19, and of "a woman" for "the woman" in chap. iv. 27. We omit these, however, for the sake of coming to the next following chapter, which contains one of the most profound discourses of our Lord preserved for us in the Gospel. We turn first to ver. 19, which runs as follows in the Authorised:—"Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." The Revisers substitute "doing" for the second "do" of the verse, and they read the last clause thus: "for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner." The improvements in "doing" for "do," in the position given to "also," and in the substitution of "in like manner" for "likewise," are great. They have a very close

bearing on the Christology of the fourth Gospel, and they unfold, with more than ordinary clearness, its great lesson of the relation of the Son to the Father—the Father the fountain of all action, yet doing nothing actually, doing all ideally; the Son equal, co-eternal with the Father, yet doing nothing ideally, doing all actually; the Son seeing only as the Father gives Him to see, hearing only as the Father gives Him to hear; but the Father giving Him both to see and to hear “what things soever He doeth,” and this by such a necessity of His own nature that He must, as the Father, express Himself in the Son, and that the Son must do all things “in like manner” as the Father does them. We do not say that this teaching may not be found even in the translation of ver. 19 given in the Authorised, but it is certainly brought out with much greater distinctness by that of the Revisers; and, upon a point at once so difficult and so central in the whole system of Christian faith, it is hardly possible to overestimate the value of any light additional to what we previously had. Similar remarks might be made upon the new translation of ver. 36. Instead, however, of dwelling upon this last verse, let us turn to another of a cognate, though not a similar kind.

In chap. v. 35, instead of the statement made by our Lord regarding the Baptist, “He was a burning and a shining light,” we find the Revisers reading, “He was the lamp that burneth and shineth.” This rendering is one of those that have been objected to; and yet the slightest reflection ought to show its superiority to that which it is intended to replace. It is, in the first place, the correct translation of the original, while the other is not. But, in the second place, it expresses, under a figure which will only appear the more beautiful the longer we dwell upon it, the true relation between Jesus and His great forerunner. Surely it is unnecessary to remind the reader that in the Gospel of St. John, Jesus is Himself the “Light.” By this term He is again and again emphatically distinguished. Along with the word “Life” it expresses the most characteristic element of His mission. The term, then, is designedly withheld from the Baptist. He was simply the “lamp,” the chief ornament of the room in which the family assembles after darkness falls, giving them light in that darkness, yet reminding them, as it shines, that it is but the symbol of a greater light which shall ere long arise, and render the use of the lamp unnecessary. Nothing could more exquisitely picture forth the waiting of Israel for its coming Messiah than this waiting of a Jewish family amidst the precious yet imperfect light of the earlier Dispensation—“I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in his word do I hope. My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning” (Ps. cxxx. 5, 6).

We cannot omit another deeply important rendering of the Revisers in the chapter with which we are now dealing—that of vers. 39, 40, “Ye search the Scriptures” (instead of “Search the Scriptures”) “because in them ye think ye have eternal life, and these are they which bear witness of me, and ye will not come to me that ye may

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

have life." No doubt the correctness of this rendering has been long a matter of dispute; and the Revisers have indicated that much may be said for the rendering commonly preferred, by putting it into the margin. We can only express our own conviction, apart from all argument here in favour of the Revisers' rendering, that this is one of those cases in which the Revised Version, if it has the opportunity given it of sinking into the popular mind, will show that it contains seeds of truth, hitherto lost sight of, from which we shall in due time reap an abundant harvest. For, what is the whole object of our Lord in this part of His discourse?—what, but to turn the minds of His hearers from everything, even from Divine preparatory arrangements, to Himself as One in whom all prophecy was fulfilled, all types were realised, all expectations were accomplished? These "Jews" did search the Scriptures reverentially, constantly, with the most scrupulous and excessive care. But the effect was the same as that which had been produced upon them by the Baptist (ver. 35). They had so prided themselves upon the gift, and had so busied themselves with the letter, that they had made the very Scriptures, given to lead them to Jesus, a means of keeping them away from Him. To men in such a condition, our Lord, even while bestowing all honour upon their ancient Scriptures,—"these are they which bear witness of Me,"—does not say "Search the Scriptures." He says rather, "Ye do search them, but ye search them in a wrong spirit, and to a wrong end. Ye make the words a substitute for Me. Your laborious searching seems to you the very essence of religion, that by which you most of all commend yourselves to God, and walk worthy of your privileges, 'ye will not come to Me that ye may have life.'" Will any one venture to say that in the Christian Church there is no need of similar teaching? or will any one deny that, in comparison with it, the lesson, "Search the Scriptures" goes but a little way to the heart of the religious deficiencies of our time? Translations such as this, when they are really studied, commend themselves in a way that makes it impossible to find words in which justly to express their value. What matters it though they disturb some old associations, jar upon some cherished feelings, or are even liable to abuse? The fruits of the past are hardly so satisfactory as to justify dread of fresh stirring of the soil in which they have grown. Nothing can be worse than to bring a religious experience, founded upon mistranslation of Scripture, as an argument against a true translation when it is offered us. Because the latter, considered in itself, seems to men at first sight "foolishness" and "weakness," they say that it cannot be Divine. They forget that their estimate of foolishness and weakness may be founded upon false assumptions. What they reject may, after all, be of God; and, if so, it is not merely our duty to accept it; we may do so joyfully, and with perfect confidence as to the result, "because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1 Cor. i. 25).

Chap. vi. 22-24 affords an interesting illustration of a purely historical passage, which, confusing as it is to every reader of the Authorised Version, is reduced to order and made perfectly intelligible in the Revised New Testament. We shall not linger upon it, thinking many other amendments more important. Yet it may be well for all interested in our inquiry to compare the two translations of these verses. If they attend to the distinction between the "boat" or "boats" (rather, as in the margin, "little boat" and "little boats"), and the "ship" spoken of, they will see at once, as in a vivid tableau, the events of which the Evangelist speaks. The people had seen the disciples depart the night before in a "boat" (ver. 17),* without their Master. When they came down to the shore in the morning they found only one "little boat" there, not large enough to hold the disciples, who could not, therefore, have returned in it. The inference was clear. Jesus must still be on the eastern shore, or He must have gone round by the northern extremity of the lake to join His disciples at Capernaum. Eagerly, but in vain, they searched for Him on the eastern shore; to go round by land to Capernaum required more patience and time than they possessed; and the one "little boat" upon the beach was far too small to be of much service to so large a number. At that moment other "little boats" came across the water from Tiberias. Their perplexity was relieved; they laid hold of them, and started for Capernaum, "seeking for Jesus." The picture is exactly such a one of searching for the Lord as to delight St. John, and hence, no doubt, the minuteness with which he dwells upon its details. It must be observed that he is speaking not of "the Jews," but of "the multitude" (ver. 22), and the two terms represent in the fourth Gospel very different classes of persons—the one, the heart stubborn and hard; the other, the heart craving for light, and feeling after it, if haply it may find it.

The solemn discourses that follow in this chapter have received many emendations; and by these their general force and meaning, although not changed, have been greatly elucidated. We shall notice only the following:—Ver. 31, "The manna," for "manna" without the article, the mind being thus more fully directed to that special supply of manna which formed so proud a boast of Israel: Ver. 32, Bread "out of" heaven, instead of "from" heaven, the thoughts being thus fixed on Jesus as Himself an essentially heavenly gift, and not merely one given by a heavenly hand: Ver. 46, "He which is from God," instead of "He which is of God;" the former words being applicable to Jesus alone as "the sent" of God, the latter being at least ambiguous, as they might be understood of the believer: Ver. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves," instead of "ye have no life in you"—an emendation of the highest

* It is greatly to be regretted that the rendering "boat" has not been also adopted instead of "ship" in ver. 22, and that the marginal readings "little boat" and "little boats" have not been admitted into the text.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

moment, as bringing out how thorough is that possession of the heart which the new life must take. It is not a strange thing in us ; it does not destroy our personality ; with it in us we are really "ourselves." Ver. 58, "and died," instead of "and are dead"—a much more vivid translation, and bringing out, in a way far more impressive than the words of the Authorised, the inability of the heavenly food granted in the wilderness to bestow that eternal life which is the believer's portion in the Son : Ver. 70, "The twelve," instead of "twelve"—again lending great additional vividness to the words of Jesus as He describes the high position of those whom He had chosen, and marking with a double force the guilt of the traitor Judas, who acted as he did although "one of the twelve" (ver. 71).

In chap. vii. we may briefly note such changes as the following, the importance of which all will readily allow :—Ver. 17, "If any man willesh to do his will, he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God," instead of "if any man will do his will," &c. The English expression "willeth to do" may not be happy, but the lesson involved has such a bearing upon our whole relation to God and the knowledge of His truth that, for the sake of it, we may well acquiesce in words not wholly pleasing to the ear : Ver. 18, "He that speaketh from himself," instead of "He that speaketh of himself," the latter translation perverting the sense, and doing it, too, in a place where the contextual words can only deepen, not correct the error. "He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory," is precisely what we should say when referring to a vainglorious boaster ; but the meaning of our Lord is altogether different. He would delineate, not an empty braggart, but a faithless messenger,—one who thinks of himself instead of the person sending him, and who does not sink himself, as Jesus did, in the thought of "Him that sent Him," so that He might deliver His Father's message in a manner perfectly accordant with His Father's will, and for His Father's glory.

On the deeply interesting passage, chap. vii. 53 to viii. 11, containing the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, it would be foreign to our present purpose to dwell. The propriety of the manner in which it has been dealt with will, in all probability, be generally recognised. There are, no doubt, other modes in which a distinction might have been drawn between it and the authentic parts of St. John's narrative. It might have been placed, in smaller print than that of the text, at the bottom of the page ; or it might have been transferred to the end of the Gospel, and there given as an appendix. Yet, if we are to read it at all, it seems better as it is. Enclosed within brackets, and separated from the ordinary flow of the type by a blank space both where it begins and where it ends, sufficient attention is called to the fact that it is not acknowledged as an integral part of the fourth Gospel. On the other hand, its having been placed where it now stands at a very early date, its even more than probable truthfulness as a story, and the pure

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

Gospel teaching of which it is so full, well entitle it to its position in the Canon of Scripture, and to the hold which it has over the Christian heart. The remainder of chap. viii. may be passed without remark.

In chap. ix. we pause only at one new rendering. It arises, indeed, from a new reading of the Greek ; but a distinction of this kind does not affect us at present when we are dealing with the New Version as a whole. The revisers had to fix their Greek as well as their English text. In the Authorised Version of chap. ix. 4 we read, "I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day." The revisers read, "We must work the works of him that sent me," &c. The reading is at first sight a little harsh, because we should naturally expect that the pronoun "us" would accompany the pronoun "we,"—"We must work the work of him that sent us." A little observation will show that this last expression would be out of keeping with the language of the fourth Gospel. It is our Lord Himself whom the Father sends, and our Lord again sends us. To find "us," therefore, in the place proposed would be contrary to all analogy ; and the special evidence is against it. On the other hand, the use of "we" at the beginning of the verse is both appropriate and beautiful. It illustrates that striking lesson of the identification of the believer and his Lord which is so deeply imbedded in the writings of St. John, and from the revival of which in the consciousness of the Church so much quickening of the spiritual life may be expected. Every text bearing upon it ought to be cherished and unfolded ; and among these, none will be found to possess more practical value than the verse of St. John's Gospel of which we are now speaking, and which has been so long misread in our common version.

In chap. x. one verse only may be noted, that in which our Lord says of His people gathered from the Jewish fold and from the wide range of heathenism, "and they shall become one flock, one shepherd" (ver. 16). The Authorised had said, "one fold, one shepherd." Of the weighty consequences depending upon the translation of this one word we have no time to speak. They can hardly be brought out without an elaborate criticism of the earlier verses of the chapter, especially of ver. 9. But this much all can at once see, that in the eyes of our Lord there is something higher than the idea of the "fold," even that idea of a "flock" which may have to come out of the Christian "fold" itself, in order to be saved in the degenerate days that are spoken of in the word of prophecy. We must not, however, pursue this theme without having more space for its discussion than we can command at present.

From chap. x. we pass to chap. xvii., the chapter which constitutes the very centre of the fourth Gospel, that Holy of Holies of the Sacred Tabernacle which is formed by the Gospel as a whole. Here, if anywhere, the Word become flesh tabernacles among us (and we behold His glory, glory as of an only begotten from a father), full of grace and truth. The words of chap. xvii. may certainly be touched with no feelings but those of an even deeper than common reverence ; but,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

precisely on that account do they also require to be considered with the utmost possible faithfulness, and to have the English translation of them amended wherever this appears to be absolutely requisite. The emendations made on this chapter, accordingly, deserve more than ordinary attention from the reader.

The first which we may notice is the substitution of the past for the perfect tense in different verses of the chapter. Ver. 2, "Even as thou gavest him authority over all flesh," instead of "Even as thou hast given him," &c.; ver. 3, "Him whom thou didst send, *even* Jesus Christ," instead of "Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent;" ver. 4, "I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work," instead of "I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work;" ver. 6, "I manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world," instead of "I have manifested thy name;" ver. 8, "And they received them (the words), and knew of a truth that I came forth from thee, and they believed that thou didst send me," instead of "And they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed," &c.; ver. 12, "And not one of them perished," instead of "And none of them is lost;" ver. 14, "And the world hated them," instead of "And the world hath hated them;" ver. 18, "As thou didst send me into the world," instead of "As thou hast sent me into the world;" ver. 21, "That the world may believe that thou didst send me," instead of "That the world may believe that thou hast sent me;" ver. 23, "That the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me," instead of "That the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, even as thou hast loved me;" ver. 25, "O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee, and these knew that thou didst send me," instead of "O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee, but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me;" ver. 26, "And I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known, that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them," instead of "And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." We have enumerated all the changes of the kind of which we are now speaking, and our readers will acknowledge that the list is a very remarkable one. Considered even in itself it is sufficient to show how deliberately the past tenses are chosen. It is true that the readings of the Greek are occasionally uncertain. Scribes seem to have been confused by the frequent transitions from the perfect to the past, and from the past to the perfect, tense. But, after making all due allowance for this, the repetition of the past so frequently, in circumstances where we should expect the perfect, is sufficient to show that it was intended to bring out some aspect of the truth which would have failed to find adequate utterance in any other method of expression. What that aspect is, it may require time for the Church, under

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

the influence of the new and more correct renderings, to discover. In the meantime, it will be enough to say that this much is evidently involved in it—we have here our Lord, not in the position of one who is merely praying for His people when He is in the immediate prospect of death, and before His own final catastrophe overtakes Him, but one who is praying for them as if He were already at the right hand of the Father, in His heavenly abode. At the moment when He utters this prayer He is not the suffering and dying,—He is already in thought the exalted and glorified Redeemer. He has passed onward to the moment when His work shall have been accomplished, and when He shall be engaged in the application of it to those for whom He died. In the other parts alike of the fourth and of the earlier Gospels, we follow our Lord, as, amidst humiliation and suffering and death, He drinks that cup of trembling which has been put into His hand. Here we are permitted to follow Him within the veil. He is in the upper and inner sanctuary; and these words of His are not merely words which He pours forth as the shadow of the cross is resting upon Himself and His disciples; they are words which are the echo of His present petitions to the Father, when, “no more in the world” (ver. 11), He prays for us who are yet left in the world to carry on His work. By how true an instinct has the Church been always accustomed to designate this prayer, the high-priestly prayer of Jesus! In heaven only is He perfect High-priest, and the words of the prayer belong to heaven rather than to earth.

To one other emendation, of profound significance, in this chapter we must call attention before we close. It occurs twice, first in the eleventh, and then in the twelfth verse. In the former, the Authorised Version reads: “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me,” and in the latter, “While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept.” The Revised Version reads—“Holy Father, keep them in thy name which thou hast given me,” and “While I was with them I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me.” The peculiarity of the Revised Version in both cases, it will be observed, is this, that the “name” is not said to be that through or in which Christ’s people are kept, but that which has been given by the Father to the Son, and that the latter has received not them but it. This “name” is the revelation of the Father in the Son; and the prayer is, that as the disciples had entered into and appropriated that revelation, so they may be always kept in it—that they may be kept in the unity of that relation to the Father which was His, that they may rejoice always in the blessed consciousness that His Father is their Father, and His God their God.

We have no space to pursue this inquiry further, or many interesting classes of emendations in connection with the fourth Gospel, as it appears in the Revised Version, might have been pointed out. But we trust

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

that enough has been said to point out the general importance of the revision of this particular book. There can be no greater mistake than to imagine that the changes introduced into the new translation are trifling, and that they relate to many particulars which might, without loss to the Church, have been left as they were. Without urging anything in the way of general argument upon this point, we would only trust that the illustrations of change here presented will show that consequences of the deepest import to the life and spirit of the Church of Christ are involved in not a few of them. The fourth Gospel has been called "the heart of Jesus." Will any one say that to know more of that heart, to become more alive to every tender emotion that proceeded from it, to mark more truly its every throb of affection however slight, is not something worthy of the most careful and loving study? If so, the words of the fourth Gospel, alike in their selection and in their slightest turns of expression are well worth all the thought that can be bestowed upon them—"Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

WILLIAM MILLIGAN.

AMONG THE WELSH PRESBYTERIANS.

WHAT is proposed in the present paper is simply to record some impressions left by contact with Welsh brethren, during a five weeks' sojourn in Wales, on one previously almost entirely unacquainted with the internal working of their Church. A narrative of the rise and progress of the Welsh Presbyterian Church has already been given in this journal, especially in the October and November numbers of last year.

The latest phase of Calvinistic Methodism was the formation (1864) of a *General Assembly* of the Associations of North and South Wales. This is the final Court of Appeal in respect of all matters affecting the welfare of the Church. The Assemblies are generally great field meetings, whose recurrence influences the entire population of that part of Wales where they are held. Next in rank to the General Assembly are the two Quarterly Association meetings of North and South Wales. These correspond very nearly to synodical gatherings in Britain and America, being intermediate between the "monthly meetings" of Presbyteries and the annual meetings of Assembly. The conduct of these Association meetings is, however, very different from Synod gatherings. Among the Welsh a distinct and sufficient time is allowed for business and conference, but the great feature of the Associations is public preaching, to which immense crowds convene from the surrounding districts.

VOL. VI.—NO. XXXV.

2 B

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

On the first day of the Association two sermons are preached at four P.M.; on the second day, likewise, there are two sermons at five; on the third day, the entire attention is given to preaching, when as many as seven or eight sermons are generally preached, beginning at six in the morning. At each Quarterly Association the time and place of the next meeting are fixed. The Association meetings thus become a great means of spiritual impulse throughout the Church. The Association for business and conference consists of persons who hold office in the Church. It is thus representative only in so far as the Church officers are themselves representative of the body of the people.

The monthly meetings correspond, as already indicated, to meetings of Presbytery, and consist of those who hold office within the bounds. At first, *counties* seemed to be a sufficient line of demarcation for separate monthly meetings, but several counties have been subdivided, owing to the rapid extension of the Church. Besides the business meeting and private meetings for inquiry, a considerable part of the time is given to preaching. Four sermons are preached at each monthly or presbytery meeting. The Welsh thus utilise for public instruction their meetings for business and conference. We believe that the preachings are not kept up in those English towns where Presbyteries meet, but in Wales they are very largely attended and much valued.

Besides the monthly or presbytery meetings, there have been begun more lately *district meetings*, which are somewhat like committee meetings or sectional meetings of Presbytery, and are to a considerable extent preparatory to the monthly meetings. The business arising from localities within the "monthly" bounds is here discussed and adjusted. No ecclesiastical authority is vested in these district meetings. They are composed of the Church officers in the district of Presbytery to which they severally belong. Finally, we find the *private society* or weekly fellowship meeting of the congregation, this being the feature of the Church which has least likeness to Presbytery as generally understood in Great Britain. Here the affairs of the congregation are settled by the body corporate. We have enjoyed the privilege, not only of being present, but of taking part in a "society meeting." The Methodist class meeting is certainly much more nearly approached here than in any arrangement connected with ordinary Presbytery, though we have known congregations in Scotland where, occasionally at least, much the same method prevails.

The minister either opens or calls on some member to open with praise, reading of Scripture, and prayer. The children of the congregation having been assembled in the front benches, are then asked to repeat the texts, and such "notes" of sermons as they may remember from the services of the previous Lord's day. Thereafter the minister may narrate some intelligence interesting to the congregation, or affecting their interests. Very frequently some topic that has been previously

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

proposed for consideration is taken up, and, somewhat after the manner of a Highland "question meeting," one after another makes a remark or quotes a passage of Scripture bearing on the topic, the minister generally repeating aloud and commenting on what may be said. Sometimes the sermons of the previous Sunday form the topic of consideration, and sometimes an "experience" service is held, when very frequently much spiritual impression is produced. Occasionally, as once when we were present, a part of the time is devoted to an address. In a town like Bala, even an English tongue will be generally understood, though in most country parts very few indeed would understand the stranger, and in reply to any question, even the simplest, nothing would be elicited but "Dim Saesoneg."

At the "Society" all matters relating to discipline are taken up and carried through, unless there be an appeal to the "monthly meeting." The rules on which discipline is conducted are thirty-four in number, and enter into all ordinary details of life, and also into many peculiar circumstances, such as how to deal with shipwrecked vessels and their cargoes. The ninth rule enjoins that members "worship the Lord in their families at least twice a-day." It is to be feared that in many places much of what is enjoined in these high-toned rules must be a dead letter. The "Society," as may be supposed, also admits members of the Church, and generally conducts its affairs.

In these gradations of functions, the chief unlikeness to other Presbyterian methods is seen in the want of some deliberative and balanced body corresponding to the representative courts of ministers and elders in Scotland, England, America, and elsewhere. With a professionally educated and an uneducated official membership, the want of a proportioned representation at the monthly and "association" meetings may sometimes prove a serious drawback.

There is no feature of Welsh Methodism so striking as the Sabbath-school management. The prominence of the young in the "Society" meeting has been noticed, but the presence of the adult membership at the classes of the Sabbath school is much more remarkable. There we have the fullest possible development of the system of congregational instruction. Grouped round their teacher, or conductor, are to be seen in the Sabbath school persons of all ages in earnest attention to the teacher, or offering some suggestion. Graduation according to years and intellectual progress is here found in fullest operation, and to this cause may, no doubt, be ascribed the superior knowledge and interest characterising the Welsh in questions of doctrine and experience. With such training and practice it is not to be wondered at that so many are possessed of ability to conduct services in the multitude of meeting-houses that are scattered throughout the country. The Welsh Presbyterians are not perplexed by the difficulty of knowing how to secure some supervision of those just on the verge of manhood and womanhood, nor are they troubled with teachers drawn so very largely, as in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

England and elsewhere, from the youngest and least experienced members of the congregation. Had Mr. Charles, of Bala, left a name for no other great and noble service to his country, his Sunday-school system and its remarkable success would entitle him to deepest gratitude. Workers on Sunday-school improvement and extension should endeavour to make themselves better acquainted with the system so admirably and so successfully carried out among the Welsh Presbyterians. The care with which young Church members, even when serving in families, are looked after is most remarkable, and suggests more thoroughly than we have noticed elsewhere the true idea of Church-fellowship—"members one of another." This care has certainly had its own reward in the devoted attachment of the people, and a generous ambition, even on the part of those in humble circumstances, to serve the interests and progress of the denomination. The proverbial attachment of the Welsh to their chapels and church-fellowship is a feature sure to strike the mind of the stranger.

Going into Wales, nothing impresses one more than the great extent to which the Welsh language is spoken by the people. There is a striking contrast between the place of Welsh in Wales and that of Gaelic in the Highlands of Scotland. Welsh is a thoroughly living language, impregnating all ranks and all affairs of life, a possession of advantage, a something to be proud of in any company, a language to be read as well as spoken, and so much the language of intelligence that the danger is to make too much rather than too little of its national hold. This causes an impression most unlike that which is to often left by the patronising tone assumed in Scotland, and sometimes even in the pulpit, when reference is made to "the poor Highlanders." Never in Wales have we noticed either the kind of Ossianic ecstasy which some assume, or the suggestion of apologetic inferiority by others when using Gaelic. If a man has goods to sell in Wales, he finds it to his advantage to print his bills or advertisements in Welsh; if he has songs and music, he prepares for a Welsh-speaking public; if he has sermons to print, he issues them in Welsh; and if he has news to give, he knows the charm and profit of employing Cymraeg. The same spirit runs through a great part of their Church life, and has perhaps become a snare. The visitor in Wales feels that if the Presbyterians there are to retain the remarkable hold which they have obtained, they must, for the sake even of their own children, do much more than they do in the use of English. The Church of England will have very little chance of reasserting itself in Wales unless through the wise combination of Welsh and English which they now employ. In the Highlands of Scotland there is almost always sufficient provision for English-speaking residents, even where the demand is much more limited than we have found it to be in some places in Wales without any arrangement to meet it. It is true, that to supply English services—and they should never be shunted into inferior places of worship—would be a considerable addi-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

tional tax on the strength and resources of the ministers, but with such traditions as belong to our Welsh brethren, this should be little thought of.

Another weakness, as it seems to us, is the over-supply of places of meeting. These might be of great use for occasional services, or for those who are providentially unable to go far from home to worship God. When, however, they are used, as they must often be, for more general purposes, and a meeting is substituted for the services of ordained ministers, the ultimate result cannot be other than injurious. May it not be feared that the less powerful hold of Calvinistic Methodism in South than in North Wales has resulted in a great degree from the want of ministerial efficiency in the past?

The admirable colleges of the denomination will, no doubt, in the course of a few more years, produce men fully equipped to meet the great wants of the young but vigorous Church. Meantime the Colleges have not reached the American and Scotch idea of the standard to which the designation belongs, at least ecclesiastically.

Churchmen may call the Calvinistic Methodists dissenters, but never did children more lovingly cling to a mother than did these Christians to the Church of England. It was only when the fear of spiritual extinction, and the loss of all that God had wrought for them and in them, compelled them, that they became a separate Church. Not till June, 1811, was the step taken of setting men apart for the dispensation of sacraments other than those so ordained by the Church of England, nor was this done without great reluctance, and after they had struggled for about eighty years to find life, nourishment, and spiritual sympathy in the Church which they so dearly loved. A more remarkable attachment could not well be imagined; nor was any spirit of dissent ever breathed by them, save against the death that pervaded the Church, and the persecution which sought to extinguish their spiritual life. We can well imagine that, as much of the spiritual death in the Established Church in Wales resulted from the wholesale appointment to charges of men—we cannot call them preachers—who knew not a word of Welsh, and would not take the trouble to learn it, there may now be an instinctive backwardness in sanctioning the use of even so much of English as altered circumstances demand. Certainly no men more bitterly and strongly deplore the spiritual desolations wrought in Wales than do many Churchmen, who now see clearly that from the reign of Queen Anne a policy, followed everywhere by spiritual death, prevailed unbroken till the conversion of Howell Harris and the noble stand of Daniel Rowlands. God then led these Welsh brethren by ways that they knew not, and it is remarkable that to-day, under Divine leading and contrary to all their own wishes and feelings, they should in their Church life approach so nearly the creed and the practice, no less than the tone of feeling, characteristic of the Presbyterian Churches of the Reformation. Holding fast by their traditions

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

and the example of their gracious predecessors, the ministers and people of the Welsh Presbyterians have a great future before them ; and when we see men, down to the third and fourth generations, occupying, in succession to their sires, the foremost places among them, we feel there is a strength of attachment and faith in the Welsh Presbyterian Church such as few Churches of Christ have the privilege to enjoy.

S. R. MACPHAIL.

CURRENT WORK OF THE PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE.

THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE.

IN a recent number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, Dr. Calderwood, writing of the work of the Alliance, specified two subjects—the formulating of the Consensus, and co-operation in Foreign Missions—as those which he considered of chief importance, and to which, as being *practical* and *pressing*, he would have the Alliance give speedy and special attention. Agreeing with him as to the importance of these subjects, there are yet, I think, some other matters which are also of this practical nature, though it may not be well to take up too many items at one time. Already the Alliance has done something to entitle it to the favourable consideration of all Presbyterians, and to justify high hope respecting its future. It has, for instance, brought different sections of the Church into a brotherly union—assuredly no unimportant matter. At Edinburgh, many branches of the Presbyterian Church were formally introduced to each other, and at Philadelphia, the delegates from these Churches shook hands as old and familiar friends. Ignorance of each other's circumstances, and almost of each other's existence, has been succeeded by a knowledge that has led to the friendliest intercourse—such as will, doubtless, go far to wipe out memories of past alienations, and possibly prevent future estrangements.

A second work, already performed, has been to bring before the Christian world the doctrinal position of the Reformed Churches, not simply as expressed in ancient Confessions, but as found in the living creeds of the Churches of to-day. Those great papers on doctrinal topics which have been read at past Councils, have a general importance and value, as being expositions of Scriptural truth ; but they have also a special importance as showing that, whatever may be the course or tendencies of others, Presbyterians stand in the main where their fathers stood, and that in matters of doctrine, the Reformed Churches are a unit the whole world over. The natural sequel to these expositions will be that formulating of the Consensus which we all desire to see completed.

But these are only preliminary matters, for the Alliance must needs be a working as well as a witnessing institution. Yet, not being a Church, it cannot do a Church's work, and can act only within its own sphere and limits. The handmaid of the Churches, an "assemblage of committees" without executive authority, it can simply gather and arrange materials, and present considerations which may serve as a basis of action to some or to all of the Churches, should these see fit to avail themselves of the views set forth.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

A Formulated Consensus would be a common flag for the Reformed Churches, while Foreign Mission co-operation is work on "no man's land." But side by side with this latter is Home Mission work—work on every man's land—a much more delicate and complicated thing. And yet every consideration that leads us English-speaking Presbyterians to be concerned about the religious condition of our native countries, should equally lead us to be concerned about that of other lands. Our people pass and repass from land to land, and of necessity are affected by the moral and spiritual atmosphere of the countries they visit. So close and intimate, in fact, are the relations among nations now-a-days, that each land is becoming a part of every other land, and a levelling down, or a levelling up, process in religious matters is taking place all over the world. Whether we like it or not, and however we may have acted in the past, we are now forced to look abroad beyond the boundaries of our own parishes, of our own Churches, of our own lands, and even of our own continents, and to have our schemes and modes of working affected by the condition of other peoples. I would name, therefore, "*Church work on the European continent*," as entitled to form, along with the two subjects that Dr. Calderwood has mentioned, the "first three" of our practical questions.

A recent brief tour in some continental countries, undertaken in the interest of the Alliance, suggests some thoughts on this subject which may prove interesting to the readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian*.

So far as the Alliance is concerned, Church work on the Continent is twofold—that with respect to English-speaking people, and that with respect to the continental Churches themselves.

In reference to the first of these, what are the facts? A large number of British and American Presbyterians reside on the Continent. There they form little colonies, each of which should have an English-speaking minister; yet up to the present time these residents have been almost entirely neglected by our Churches. Not so acts the Anglican Church, British or American. Wherever an opening can be obtained, up goes an Anglican Church building, arrangements being at once made for the frequent or regular holding of Episcopal Church service. There is thus hardly a village on the Continent where English live in which one does not find an Episcopal church. The result is, that our people who may also be there become Anglicanised, ceasing to care for Presbyterianism; when they return home we find them considerably altered, and blame the Continent for the change. Ought we not rather to blame ourselves for not having gone after these wandering sheep, and thus kept up our connection with them?

One branch of this work is specially important. Every year a large number of young men go from Britain and America to the continental universities. Some of these reside there but a single session, while others remain for several years. Have we no responsibility in reference to these? While at home we had all manner of societies for these young men as a class; why should we neglect them absolutely when they go to the Continent, where we say that the dangers to their morals and to their Christian faith and character are so great? There ought to be a Presbyterian Union church in every continental university town.

Another part of this much-needed English-continental work consists in providing religious ordinances for summer visitors. An ever-increasing number of tourists go annually to the Continent. For these how few are the services provided by the Presbyterian Churches. While of the tourists, how few know before they start where such services are held. Ought not these services to be multiplied

376 CURRENT WORK OF THE PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

tenfold, and such publicity given to the arrangements that every intending visitor might know when planning his tour at what points he would find a Presbyterian church or minister? *The Catholic Presbyterian* would be an excellent medium for making such arrangements known.

The continental Churches are burdened with such special difficulties, that we must ever feel ourselves under obligation to render them what service we can. These Churches are to a great extent one with us in doctrine and in polity. We owe it to the principles of faith and government which we hold, to seek their diffusion. We owe it to our brethren, as fellow-heirs of a great inheritance purchased for us both by the blood of the martyrs, to be fellow-workers with them in their efforts to maintain the ground already in their hands. Measured by our standard, it is true that the Christian activity and aggressiveness of the continental Churches are low, but this may be the result of their position. They suffer from the chilling influence of a wide-spread and dominant Romanism; from a worldliness more intense than we have ever experienced; from an unbelief of which, in its varied forms, we know next to nothing; and from the effects of their present connection with the State. Through this connection they have been deprived of their proper autonomy, while by the system of concurrent endowment, each Church is bound over to keep the peace towards its neighbours, for every man is regarded as connected with some Church, and one Church is held and declared by the State to be as good as another. Hence, practically, the Churches are debarred from Christian work, and missionary labour is impossible. This enforced inactivity enfeebles spiritual life, and the world gains the upper hand. In these circumstances, our tenderest sympathy and heartiest co-operation should be ever with these Churches.

During my recent visit to friends on the Continent, I had this subject before me, and I may be allowed to give the impressions I formed as to the present condition of the lands and of the Churches. I may just state here that in conversation with friends in many countries, I found everywhere great joy expressed at the existence of our Alliance, as being a bond of union among the Reformed Churches and also a manifestation of it. *The Catholic Presbyterian*, the unofficial organ of the Alliance, is read by many, and most highly prized. In fact, *The Catholic Presbyterian* is the right arm of the Alliance, as enabling the Churches in different lands to become aware of each other's circumstances and experiences, and but for its influence and work, our Alliance would be a very feeble and crippled organisation.

BELGIUM has not, and never has had, a Reformed Church. Romanism of the most ultramontane type has long held that interesting country under its feet. Of late a new spirit has arisen, more perhaps of a political complexion than religious or Biblical, a spirit indeed that *protests*, but that is by no means *Protestant*, simply a breaking loose from the control of Rome, so that there is going on there at present a keen struggle between the Church and her opponents. By the constitution of 1831, freedom of speech has been secured, and thus Christian workers can go where they please, and give addresses freely on religious subjects. Evangelistic effort is therefore the work appropriate for Belgium to-day. And this is being conducted, and with gratifying results, by the *Belgium Christian Missionary Church*. The membership of this Church, including a large number of its ministers, evangelists, Scripture-readers, &c., consists, mainly, of converted Romanists. By leaving a State-supported Church (that of Rome), these of necessity became "separated from the State," and have remained in this position

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

ever since, maintained in their working by their own contributions and those of Christian friends. Evangelistic work is also carried on by the "Union of Evangelical Congregations," which receives some aid from the State. Aid given to these workers will be wisely expended. But what provision exists in Belgium for the English-speaking people? Six thousand of such reside in Brussels itself, and for these there are simply three small Anglican churches representing, it is said, the well-known High, Low, and Broad school sections of that Church, while for Presbyterians and Nonconformists of any or of every type, there is no provision whatever. Might not, ought not, something to be done in such a city?

In HOLLAND, again, there is a National Church, but one whose condition is very unhappy. Having no jurisdiction over its ministers, it is unable to protect its pulpits or its chairs from departures from its confessional position. Rationalism has therefore made terrible headway in this country. Professor Kuenen, of Leyden, may represent "the religion of Israel" to be a mere ethical monotheism, or whatever else he pleases, and the poison he scatters goes forth as the teaching of a professor of the Holland Reformed Church, one who has accepted the canons of Dort as the confession of his faith, and who is to-day, notwithstanding his publications, in good and regular standing inside his own Church! As the result of a long continuance of this state of matters, many people have come to love to have it so. Hence, inside the Church there is a wing, the left, that exhibits the most advanced "Criticalism." On the right wing, represented by such men as Professor Kuyper of Amsterdam, we have an Evangelical section that is striving, and with considerable success, to bring the Church back to a Scriptural position. These brethren hope that soon the people will demand the restoration by the State to the Church of her former liberties and power. Meantime, while fighting the battle of the faith inside the Church, they are engaged in a sharp conflict with certain brethren outside of it. Some years ago the sad condition of the National Church led to the secession of a considerable number of pious ministers and members. These now form the present Free Church of Holland, and looking back on the Church they have left, ascribing a large part of her present wretchedness to her State connection, they agitate earnestly for the separation of Church and State. The Evangelicals within the National Church defend the principle of Church establishments, and have thus a double fight on their hands, with what result remains to be seen. A third party inside the National Church forms a kind of Centre, having its headquarters at Utrecht. Were its influence thrown more heartily and more hopefully into the scale with the Evangelicals, the probable result might be more satisfactory. In view of these things, such an institution as the New University of Amsterdam is entitled to a large measure of aid from every supporter of the old doctrinal beliefs of the Church of Holland.

Every one passing through GERMANY has forced upon him the difference between religious life as we are familiar with it, and as it exists in that country. There, there is a very special need of a warm breath of revival for all the Churches. The Lutherans are not, as a whole, advancing along the Evangelical line, but rather becoming more Ritualistic, while the Reformed Churches, with very commendable activity in some quarters, are yet so hampered by their State connection, by their surroundings, and by the past in their history, that they also are sadly deficient in that aggressive character which is indispensable for Church life or prosperity. How those outside can be of service is a difficult question to answer, but, doubtless, the way may be found.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

IN SWITZERLAND the progress of "freedom," that is, of the rejection of all Church authority and Church confessions, has resulted in a kind of ecclesiastical anarchy. Ministers may for the most part preach what they please, provided their congregations are satisfied, and no trouble is made with their neighbours. The little Evangelical Society in Geneva is doing what it can to maintain Gospel truth, and though not yet fully organised according to Presbyterian principles, is still eminently worthy of all confidence from those that cherish the memory of Calvin, and adhere to those views of Bible truth with which his name is associated. Professor Godet at Neuchatel, and the Church of the Canton de Vaud, are also witnessing a good confession; but what are they among so many?

When we cross into FRANCE we are confronted with a terrible problem. Under the inevitable reaction from the clericalism of the past, France seems to be rushing into irreligion. It is not unbelief simply, it is absolute materialism. Since, however, freedom of speech exists, the present is a precious moment for preaching the Gospel. Now it would be a mistake to suppose that France is clamouring for the Gospel. The fact is, simply that instructive addresses on any subject are sought for by the awakening of mind in France, and hence the people will listen attentively to a good and impressive speaker, no matter whether he proclaim the Gospel of the grace of God, or that there is no God at all. Among those availing themselves of the present opening, is M. Réveillaud. He appeals chiefly to the educated classes, seeking to show these, that patriotism should lead them to embrace the Gospel, as being the only true protector of civil liberty. M. Réveillaud's work is of great value, and worthy of all support. In his hands that line of argument is safe, but in less competent hands such a movement as he conducts, might drift into a mere political agitation, or to a subordinating of the Gospel to the political movements of the day.

The M'All movement has reached, I think, a crucial point. Broadly stated, the great problem of the Churches to-day is, *How shall the lowest classes in a community be reached by the Gospel.* Mr. Moody has sought to solve this problem by holding a series of monster meetings in different towns, making use of a machinery in connection with them, the most perfect that perhaps has ever been employed in this work. And yet as to permanent influence on the masses, Mr. Moody's work is by no means a success. Its most valuable results have been in the quickening of professing believers and setting these to work. As these are already inside some particular Church, the work of necessity thus becomes to some extent a Church work. In New York the City Mission Society is trying to solve the problem by building churches and employing ordained ministers to take charge of the congregations gathered into these, and dispensing ordinances. This is Church work without Church connection or Church organisation, and is simply the forming not so much of independent congregations as of a City Mission denomination. Mr. M'All tries to solve the problem in reference to France by a kind of City Mission instrumentality, covering Paris with a network of preaching stations and going to the people with an open Bible. To a certain extent his work has been successful. A large number of people have heard the Gospel, and doubtless, not a few of them have accepted of Christ. But what next? What is to become of these people?—the "housing" of converts being one of the greatest practical difficulties of undenominational evangelistic work. Suppose these people—as is said to be the case—are unwilling to enter the neighbouring churches, is Mr. M'All going to meet the difficulty by forming a new denomination? Whitefield tried that and failed. Nor will the forming

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

in Paris of a quasi-theological seminary with teachers from all denominations for the training of evangelists be a better solution. This would be simply attempting to carry on and to keep outside the Church, a movement whose weakest point is, that it is already there. Under these circumstances, the next move in the M'All work may well be looked for with considerable anxiety by the friends of evangelistic work everywhere, and of French work in particular. Free lance work has failed in war, in art, in politics, in social reform. Is it going to succeed in Christian work? Or shall Mr. M'All's experience but go to confirm the old belief that Christ's work of Church extension can be conducted successfully only by and through Christ's institution—His own Church?

The French National Church suffers from the same trouble as do so many other of the Continental Churches. It has no autonomy. Subject to the State for reasons of state, it is not allowed a supreme court, or to exercise any confessional authority over its ministers or members. In the absence, therefore, of any *synode officielle* it is compelled to hold a *synode officieux* in which the evangelical pastors and elders assemble for common counsel and conference, but which is wholly powerless to control even those who attend. The Church is therefore weak and disheartened, and the wonderful opportunities of the present are by no means fully improved. Of this many pastors are aware, and they regret it profoundly. A remedy might be found in the French pastors acquainting themselves more than they do at present with the working of Churches elsewhere, and then applying in a proper manner the experience of these Churches to their own position. Along with this might go very advantageously a good deal more intercourse between the Churches of these other lands and the Church of France, so that, obtaining a better knowledge of its difficulties, they would be better able to sympathise with, and to encourage it.

One of the great questions apparently in the near future for France, is that of the separation of Church and State, by the withdrawal of the dotation, at present voted annually for the different religious bodies. This, some desire, and others dread; desire, as promising freedom for the Church to govern herself; dread, as likely to lessen the semi-governmental character which the Church has to-day, and which these persons say, is of consequence in a country whose people are so much accustomed to officialism as are the French. They also dread the effect on Romanism of such a step. They say that to release the Church of Rome from the measure of subjection in which she is at present to the State, would be followed by such an organising of an *imperium in imperio* as might soon endanger, not only the religious liberties of other communities, but even the civil liberties of the whole land. They therefore do not believe that, however Gambetta may talk about the religion of human culture, or reject the supernatural, or stigmatise clericalism as the enemy of the country, that even he will ever propose so radical a measure.

In the midst of all this turmoil, the Free Churches are going on their way. Mourning the loss of Pastor Fisch, who was a man of remarkable adaptation to his position, and whose removal every Christian enterprise in France will feel, they preach the Gospel, exercise church discipline, conduct schools, and support all measures that contemplate the separation of Church and State. Their position is, of necessity, one of considerable difficulty, and they both need and deserve all the support that can be given them by members of the Alliance. Should the French Government withdraw the present endowments of the National Church, then the only barrier which at present separates those Churches will be

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

removed, and a union between them will be both possible and in the highest sense dutiful. Into such a union, the National Church would bring numbers, property, a historic name, social prestige, as well as no little piety in her people and ability in her ministers; while the Free Churches would bring with them a Christian aggressiveness, a spirit of liberality and a practical acquaintance with financial and evangelistic methods to which the National Church is entirely strange. Such experiences would be of the utmost service to the united body, and then, quickened by a special baptism of the Holy Spirit, the truly National French Church might go forth in more than her earliest power for the conquering of her beautiful land for Him who bought her, and France become in the truest sense, that "eldest daughter of the Church" of whom it might come to be said, "Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all."

I am unable to speak at present of the other Reformed Churches of Europe; these notes may show how important the work is which the Alliance is carrying on, and what good service it will render if it can increase the efficiency of those who are "holding the fort" till reinforcements come.

G. D. MATHEWS.

NOTES OF THE DAY.

CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES.—Year by year, the various Church systems are, in one respect at least, coming nearer each other. The three chief Church systems are—prelacy, or government by the individual; independency, or government by the people; and presbytery, or government by representatives chosen by the people, and ordained to office by the Church. The various congresses, unions, and conferences, Episcopal, Congregational, and Wesleyan, of which the autumn newspapers generally have so copious reports, indicate more or less of approach to the last-named system. It is true they claim nothing more than moral influence, not positive authority; but they seek to create a preponderating public sentiment that shall cause questions in the Church to be settled in accordance with the views elicited at such meetings. The most reasonable and Scriptural defenders of presbytery hold that the value of that system of government lies in the opportunity it provides for brotherly and prayerful conference, and in the absence of lordly dictation. It is interesting to mark the Episcopal Congresses following so closely the Presbyterian system. The very bishops, though presiding, do not there profess to dictate, but only to confer. It is interesting, too, to observe the readiness to call in the aid of laymen. Their presence seems to bring fresh air and daylight into the meetings. There seems a want, however, of any method to secure the orderly appointment of laymen, and to secure that the laymen appointed shall be suitable men. We live in times when Church systems must be tried by their efficiency, and when the great necessities and difficulties of the age compel all earnest men to ponder the question—What is the system best fitted, under Divine blessing, to build up and strengthen the kingdom of God?

THE SALVATION ARMY.—This institution seems to be becoming one of the problems of the time. Of course it is utterly condemned by men who hate earnestness, and it is hardly less seriously dealt with by those who idolise decorum. But others take a different view of it. For the sake of distant readers, it may be explained that it is an organisation for pressing on men the claims of the Gospel and the consideration of their eternal welfare, having a military constitu-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

tion, under the idea that this is the true way to "fight the good fight of faith." Men and women, young and old, are equally employed, and any method that will arrest attention, however noisy or *outré*, is counted a valuable means of attaining the end. "Hallelujah lasses" play a conspicuous part in the work of the army, endeavouring by singing hymns and other methods, to excite attention and bring the masses within reach of the message of mercy. The *War-Cry*, the organ of the army, has a very large circulation, and the whole movement is characterised by a warmth, a freedom, a vivacity that are greatly welcomed by the masses, for whom ordinary Gospel ministrations are usually far too proper and too cold.

Most members of the old Churches dislike the method used, yet many have a feeling that the power which it seems to have of touching the masses is an element of extraordinary value. For it is generally admitted that even the most successful of our evangelistic agencies have failed to reach the lowest stratum of the community. Here seems to be a method that succeeds where other methods have failed. It is, therefore, no wonder that some good men are disposed to take this view of the operations of the army: "We find many faults in it, and we would not personally give it our countenance; we would not be held responsible for many things that it does; but neither would we oppose it; time will probably tone down its extravagancies, but so far as it does good, we wish it well."

The truth seems to be, that as Christian organisations become older, they feel the necessity of education and culture, and in laying aside their primitive ruggedness, they sometimes lose their earnestness and their power. The beginning of the Wesleyan movement was, in many ways, not unlike the work of the Salvation Army. Wesley was a gentleman and a scholar, but his agents were often rude enough. By-and-by Wesleyanism began to wear soft clothing, and then Primitive Methodists seemed to take up the original rôle. We suppose that all Methodists are now coming more or less under the influence of culture and refinement, so that the old place is again vacant, and the Salvation Army steps in to fill it. In due time the Salvation Army, if it becomes permanent, will get too fine, and some new organisation will start up on its lines. We do not think that this process is true of all countries; it is not true, for instance, of Scotland. Even Wesleyanism never obtained much of a footing there; and except, perhaps, in one or two large towns, we doubt whether the Salvation Army, if it should come to Scotland, would get much success. England seems a more favourable field for such methods of work. Scotland is more intellectual and less emotional; but, moreover, in Scotland, the Christian Church has been much more closely in contact with the mass of the people, and, therefore, the sound of the Gospel is not so new to them.

There are many great risks connected with this movement, and not the least is the risk of a great system of spiritual despotism. The idea of military command for the Church is not only not a New Testament idea, but the very opposite of that idea; and here is a possible source of enormous danger. The rough and ready handling of sacred things, and the obtrusion of the most solemn and awful truths on men's attention in such a manner as almost to provoke irreverence, is another very serious evil. Still, we are sure, there is real zeal in the movement; and zeal is never to be despised. The Church of Rome, which has a good deal of the wisdom of the serpent, never despises zeal, or quenches it abruptly, but tries to turn it into channels where it may do as much good and as little harm as possible. The Salvation Army, however, being under no control but that of its own officers, is not likely to be influenced much from without.

There is one obvious lesson from all this—the existing Churches, with their powerful organisations, ought to realise more vividly their obligations to evangelise those around them, and especially the lowest class. Churches are very apt to become selfish like individuals, and aim at making everything comfortable for themselves. They have need to consider the claims of others, and to remember that they exist as an agency for spreading the leaven throughout the whole mass. One

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

thing is very certain—there is a right way of reaching the lowest class ; our Lord succeeded in doing it, for the common people heard him gladly. Probably it is not any particular method of working that secures this end, but rather the spirit of the workers—humble, sympathetic, brotherly, tender—the very spirit of Jesus Christ.

IN MEMORIAM.—It is seldom that any month passes without bringing the record of the departure of ministers in our ranks who have deserved well of their generation. We have noted with great regret the death of the Rev. Cyrus Dickson, D.D., a prominent name in the Presbyterian Church of the United States, North. Dr. Dickson had many claims to the respect and love of his brethren, but was especially noted for his service in connection with Home Mission and Church Extension work. It was on this subject that Dr. Dickson spoke at great length at the meeting of Council in Edinburgh, displaying a great map of the United States, and showing with great earnestness the vastness of the Home Mission field opened up to the Churches, and the magnitude of the efforts they were making to overtake it. In Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church has buried one of her chief fathers—the Rev. P. Davidson, D.D., of Edinburgh. Dr. Davidson was not so much in the public eye as many of his brethren, but he enjoyed a high reputation for intellectual ability and able preaching. It was but lately that his jubilee was celebrated, and a new church, built to accommodate the congregation of which he was minister, received the name of the Davidson Memorial Church—a token of the desire of his friends and brethren to keep his name in perpetual remembrance.

AMERICAN NOTES.

DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT—A NEW SECT—THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH PROPERTY—HAMILTON COLLEGE—PRESBYTERIAN EDUCATION—PRINCETON—NEW ENGLAND—PROSPERITY OF THE COUNTRY.

WHILE I am writing, the nation is in the bitterness of its sorrow on the death of the President of the United States. Long before you read these lines, you will have heard of the protracted struggle, the eighty days of painful conflict, borne with the heroism of a Christian martyr, and the final catastrophe. How much prayer was made ; how the people longed to have the noble life preserved ; how they hoped against hope, and would not believe that the sacrifice would be required ; all this and more you have heard with intense sympathy. One of the most beautiful and touching circumstances connected with our great national bereavement is the extraordinary degree of feeling the event has awakened in foreign lands. If we could have entertained the sentiment that our form of government, and our remoteness from European interests, had deprived us, as a people, of the active and even tender sympathies of the kingdoms of the Old World, such a delusion would be wholly dissipated by the messages which have come from beyond the sea, in this hour of our unspeakable national distress. No event in our history has developed so completely the kinship of man. We have seen nothing in these expressions that was formal or perfunctory. The words from Her Majesty, the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, touched the universal heart of the American people. They remembered that she, having been herself afflicted, knew how to sympathise with her who is so suddenly plunged into the abyss of woe. Is it too much to hope that out of our great calamity may come a conviction of the common bond of fellowship that should unite all nations, so that when one suffers, all may sympathise with it, and learn to bear one another's burdens ? Is not the day at hand, has it not indeed come, when civilised and Christian nations will put up the sword, and adjust their differences as brethren should ?

It is just one hundred years since the last act was performed in the drama of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

that revolutionary war, by which the American colonies, now the United States, were separated from the mother country. In that brief century two of our chief magistrates have fallen by the hands of assassins. Two others have died during their brief term of office. The gentleman who now succeeds to the presidency is therefore the fourth who has been called to that office by the death of the one elected by the people. The easy transition of the one to the seat of power and responsibility made vacant by the death of the other, is a beautiful illustration of the working of our system of government. So long as the people are intelligent and imbued with the Christian sentiment, they may be trusted with the power of choosing their own rulers.

But this catastrophe in our Republic, though the shock may not be followed with any further calamity to the nation, coming, as it does, so soon after the assassination of the Emperor of Russia, and attempts on the lives of other rulers, suggests the thought that there is a spirit of evil abroad; that Atheism, and Communism, and Nihilism have their disciples in all lands, and that society itself is in peril just in proportion to the prevalence of these pernicious sentiments. The Church is the preserving salt of the earth. The Gospel is the saving power.

It is well to put on record, as one of the vagaries of religious fanaticism, the recent appearance of a new sect, calling themselves "Overcomers," that has sprung up in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois. They claim direct inspiration for its members, and especially for a woman named Lee, who is "the Moses of their new dispensation." They pretend to work miracles; believe in the final salvation of all, even of the devil, &c. &c. A part of them are said to be on their way to Jerusalem, to rebuild the temple and restore the Jews. The accounts we have of them are as complete a jumble of fanaticism, Irvingism, modern perfectionism, and of deluded ignorance as has ever been found in any of the thousand sets that have sprung up in the history of the world. They will have a brief existence as a sect, but will make some noise while they have a name to live.

I sent you in my last the summary of the Presbyterian Church in the Northern States. Herewith you have statistics of the Church in the South, and the facts condensed in this table are worthy of attentive study.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY

OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (SOUTHERN) FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.
Synods,	12	12	12	12	12
Presbyteries,	63	64	66	67	67
Candidates,	176	145	165	145	144
Licentiates,	83	73	73	79	72
Ministers,	1,032	1,044	1,049	1,060	1,061
Churches,	1,830	1,878	1,892	1,928	1,957
Licensures,	52	41	33	53	29
Ordinations,	41	55	34	38	28
Installations,	54	71	67	82	69
Ministers deceased,	11	24	40	19	26
Pastoral dissolutions,	51	49	47	40	40
Ministers received from other denominations, 1		7	3	3	3
Ministers dismissed to other denominations, 1		5	6	4	2
Churches organised,	43	47	38	47	38
Churches dissolved,	12	24	10	18	16
Churches received from other denominations, 5		2
Churches dismissed to other denominations, 3		3	1
Ruling elders,	5,122	5,428	5,901	5,721	5,933
Deacons,	3,338	3,452	3,770	3,811	3,908
Added on examination,	6,302	6,375	6,351	5,920	4,839
Added on certificate,	3,066	3,471	3,209	3,614	3,234
Total communicants,	112,550	114,578	116,755	120,028	121,915
Adults baptised,	1,947	2,135	2,001	1,892	1,578
Infants baptised,	4,565	4,561	4,829	4,705	4,143
Number of baptised non-communicants, 22,582		24,968	25,470	29,397	31,254
Number in S. S. and Bible classes,	66,624	68,121	70,224	74,902	74,420

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Sustentation,	\$39,195	\$27,327	\$26,864	\$32,128	\$31,768
Evangelistic,	12,736	12,689	14,359	15,233	16,474
Invalid Fund,	9,470	9,042	8,876	10,384	9,887
Foreign Missions,	39,483	34,939	36,061	39,577	47,893
Education,	30,088	34,028	29,611	26,012	51,883
Publication,	10,595	14,226	7,730	8,796	8,720
Presbyterial,	11,523	12,146	12,306	12,948	12,930
Pastors' salaries,	512,580	532,502	505,957	532,869	526,420
Congregational,	392,093	303,814	320,778	336,692	325,013
Miscellaneous,	53,208	50,258	53,161	47,699	83,688
	\$1,110,971	1,030,971	1,015,703	1,062,338	1,114,676

JOSEPH R. WILSON, *Stated Clerk.*

In several places serious troubles have occurred in Roman Catholic congregations, growing out of the manner in which their Church property is held. Being vested in the bishop of the diocese, the people have no control over it, and even Irish Romanists rebel against this state of things, when they have breathed American air a few years. Recently, in Brooklyn, across the river from New York, a church was in debt, and an extensive series of collections of money have been made to pay for it. It is alleged by some of the members that enough money has been raised to clear off the debt several times. Recently Bishop Loughlin wished to put an additional mortgage of \$25,000 on the church, and the church rebelled. Application was made to him for a financial statement, but this he refused to make, and then application was made to Cardinal M'Closkey to act in the matter. He declined to interfere, as the question at issue was one of statute law. Then the bishop announced that he would excommunicate the members of the Law Committee if they instituted proceedings to bring the bishop into court, and would withdraw the priest and close the church. One of the prominent members of the church says:—

"The time has gone by for Irishmen in this free country to believe that if they are excommunicated they cannot go to heaven, or to think that only good Catholics go there. They think that good Protestants have just as good a chance. Irishmen hold these old-fashioned notions of bigotry in their native land, but not here. You should have seen the people when the bishop's threat was read. Their faces all showed that they were not frightened by the bugbear, but were determined to fight it through. The threat did not and will not scare any one."

But the bishop will win. The Romanists make a great outcry now and then, but they are soon cowed down. The bishops hold the purses as well as the consciences of the people, who are as abject slaves in America as they are in Italy or Ireland.

The enormous defalcations of Archbishop Purcell and his brother at Cincinnati will not soon be forgotten, although the poor people who in all confidence deposited with them their hard earnings to the amount of millions of dollars will never see their money again. The later financial difficulties at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., are reported by the Rev. President as "definitely settled," but it is added: "A basis of compromise with the creditors has been reached, which, although involving serious loss to them, is yet far more beneficial than a sale of the college could be."

The inauguration of the Rev. Henry Darling, D.D., as President of Hamilton College, has this significant interest to Presbyterians, that it marks the first distinctive movement toward a Presbyterian College in the State of New York. This is popularly called the Empire State; not because its form of government differs from the other, but because of its pre-eminence in population, resources, commerce, and wealth. This one State has now a larger population than the whole thirteen colonies had one hundred years ago, when they became independent States. It contains about five millions of people. Nearly one-third of the Northern Presbyterian Church is in the State of New York. The Presbyterians,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

therefore, undertake to endow this flourishing institution and take it under their distinctive patronage. They will attempt, and I hope successfully, to raise this year \$500,000 or £100,000, to give ample salaries to a large corps of professors, and put the college on a permanent foundation. Its number of students is now about two hundred.

Princeton College, in New Jersey, though not under the direction of any ecclesiastical body, is virtually a Presbyterian institution. Since Dr. M'Cosh came from Belfast to its presidency, it has received in donations more than two millions of dollars. It has had a larger accession of students this fall than at any former period of its history.

Nine New England colleges have received during the past year gifts amounting to \$1,278,000 distributed as follows:—Harvard, \$500,000; Yale, \$250,000; Tufts, \$120,000; Dartmouth, \$110,000; Wesleyan, \$100,000; Amherst, \$75,000; University of Vermont, \$50,000; and Smith, \$43,000. The gift to Wesleyan was made conditional upon the raising of a similar sum, which will be soon received. And Mr. Seney, the munificent donor, has given \$70,000 to Wesleyan Female College, Ga.

Our theological seminaries have not opened with as large additions to their number of students as we had reason to expect. The whole subject of "raising up" young men for the ministry is one that has not been sufficiently elucidated, to make the mind of the Church clear and decided as to the best methods. And I do not know of any department of Church work in which your magazine could be more useful than in presenting the ways and means pursued in the several branches of our Church and the comparative results.

New England is largely Congregational. One of its ministers has recently furnished some interesting statistics in regard to the present condition of its churches. He says:—

"In New England there are 1472 Congregational churches; of these 619 have pastors, 545 have acting pastors, and 308 are vacant. Of the 342 churches that have a membership of 200 or over, 277 have pastors, only 43 have acting pastors, and 22 are vacant. In Massachusetts eighty-eight per cent. of the churches, with a membership of 200 or over, have pastors, eight per cent. have acting pastors, and four per cent. are vacant. Of the 426 churches which have a membership between 100 and 200, 215 have pastors, 157 acting pastors, and 54 are vacant. The remaining 704 churches in New England have a membership less than 100, 127 have pastors, 345 have acting pastors, and 232 are vacant. Of the Congregational churches in New England with a membership of over 200, eighty-one per cent. have pastors; of churches with a membership between 100 and 200, fifty per cent.; and of churches with a membership less than 100, seventeen per cent. have pastors. If the number of church membership is any test of the ability of a church to give an adequate ministerial support, it would seem to indicate that in proportion to the ability of the churches in the same proportion we find the pastoral relation. Seventy per cent. of all the Congregational churches in the country with a membership over 200, have regularly installed pastors."

The prosperity of this country in all its material interests, was never greater than now. Notwithstanding the immense influx of European immigrants, the demand for labour is greater than the supply. Oh that we could make the same report of the state of religion. The churches are not revived, and additions to them are not multiplied as they have been in some former years.

S. IRENAUS PRIME.

GENERAL SURVEY.

GREAT BRITAIN.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.—The Foreign Missions of the Established Church appear to be vigorous, especially at Calcutta. In 1878, the General Assembly's Institution, for the first time in the history of any "aided college" in India, had a greater number of students than even the "Presidency's College." Since then it has more than kept its position, with its 500 students; while in the school department there was an attendance of 700. The European agency consists of two ministers and two laymen. The annual cost to the Church is stated to be the moderate sum of £1800.

A deputation of the Free Church Foreign Mission's Committee had an interview with Mr. Grant Duff before his leaving for India, on the subject of their College at Madras, which "has developed into a representative institution, supported by three of the missionary bodies in Southern India." Complaint is made that the college does not receive the grants to which it is entitled by the famous Education Dispatch of 1854. There is general and strong dissatisfaction in India as to the way in which that dispatch has been carried out. It is said that in 1824 there was one in six of the boys of school age at school in the Madras Presidency; in 1854, one in eleven; and in 1880, one in thirteen. The decrease seems very extraordinary.

The mission funds of the United Presbyterian Church made a notable rise last year, and this increase still continues. There is an increase on the eight months of 1881 which have run, of £1700 over the corresponding period of 1880.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—The Church Congress has been holding its annual meeting at Newcastle. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Manchester, and Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, occupied the Presidential chair. So far as numbers are concerned, the Congress was a great success. The number of tickets taken was unprecedented.

There was no greeting to the Congress from the Dissenters, as at Leicester. After consultation, it was found they were not unanimous on the subject—the famous speech of the Bishop of Peterborough having given deep offence—so that the idea was given up. The Wesleyans had resolved, it is said, from the first, to take no part in a deputation.

The bill of fare was very large. It included a great variety of papers under the general headings of—(1.) The Relation of the Church of England to Churches in Communion with her. (2.) The Duty of the Church in regard to Secularism and Spiritualism. (3.) The Organisation and Development of Lay Work. (4.) The Limits within which Varieties of Ritual may be permitted. (5.) The Connection between Church and State—what we gain by it, and what we lose by it. (6.) The Adaptation of the Parochial System to Towns and Rural Districts. (7.) The Responsibility of the Church as regards the Opium Traffic with China. (8.) The Relation of the Church to the Social Movements of the Age. Among the papers under the second head there was a lively and telling one by the Archbishop of York, the idea of which was the indestructibility of the religious element in man. In the very hour of imagined atheistic triumph, the old hymns would be heard again. As Lord Beaconsfield long ago said, in the House of Commons—"Throw down the churches if you will, but you are sure to rebuild them." Dr. Thomson mentioned the curious fact, that the two famous pessimists, Schopenhauer and Leopardi, had a common horror of *cholera morbus*, and "that they fled from it as if life had been the highest bliss." Of course the discussion on the Limits of Ritual was very lively. The Dean of Durham read a long paper on the side of latitude. It seems to us heavy and ineffective, and its con-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

jurings with the "Primitive Church" and the first three centuries very little to the point. But it shows how the wind blows that it was received with great applause. Archdeacon Bardsley took the opposite side, and had not the same favourable reception. The discussion on Disestablishment was looked forward to with great interest. The hall was crowded. But if the question be a burning one, the papers were not burning. The first was by the Bishop of Carlisle. He put the gains from Establishment as chiefly three—(1.) The reservation of the ancient endowments, which he regards as of high value in securing an educated and independent ministry. (2.) The breadth and liberality which an establishment almost necessarily implies. (3.) The likelihood that under an established Church there will be a more lively sense of the claims of the country generally to spiritual help. On the side of losses, he puts the abuses connected with patronage; the difficulty of removing inefficient ministers; the tendency of a State Church to make the ministerial office be sought for mere respectability. The gains are fundamental, not the losses. The second paper, by the Dean of Manchester, was intensely High Church. Dr. Chalmers had made him an anti-voluntary, and the gains from establishment were every way, he thought, greater than the losses. He, however, desired important changes. Parliament no longer represented the laity of the Church, and a lay House of Convocation would need to be established—Parliament being expected, apparently, simply to accept its resolutions, and turn them into statutes. The paper of the well-known Mr. M'Coll, ultra-High Church also, seems to have made no impression. Perhaps people are beginning to estimate Mr. M'Coll more correctly. We believe the whole thing was rather a disappointment. There was no want of boldness on the part of members of the Congress in stating their views. For instance, the Rev. Mr. Stubbs, in dealing with the question—"What has English Christianity to say to Democracy?" pointed out the dangers connected with huge accretions of landed property in the hands of individual proprietors, and in the county of the greatest of English land-owners, he quoted the saying of Pliny, "*Latifundia perdidere Italiani*."

METHODISM.—The Methodist Ecumenical has proved on the whole a success. The interest apparently kept up to the close. A great many useful and vigorous papers were read. They dealt with important and practical questions bearing upon Church life and work. They were such as the following:—"The Itinerant Ministry," "Lay Preachers," "Woman's Work," "Practical Holiness," "The Training of Children in Christian Homes," "The Relation of Methodism to the Sabbath," "Temperance," "Perils from Popery," "Perils from Worldliness," "Perils from Innovations," "Hymns," "Home-Missions," "The Unconverted Rich," &c. Instead of resolving itself into a theological or speculative debating society, the Conference kept in the lines, so to speak, of its past history. Its aim was evidently to have such an interchange of thoughts and views as might be helpful towards the saving of human souls and the evangelisation of the world. There was a decided clinging to the old paths, and no disposition to take a sort of apologetical position, as if there were any failing of conviction, or as if Christianity were a thing that might be doubted. Referring to the discussion of one or two of the subjects we have mentioned, the Conference gave no uncertain sound upon the Sabbath. It was strongly asserted to be an institution of God. A great battle would have to be fought for it. An American bishop suggested that ministers should be very careful about their Sunday travelling. "It knocks a good deal of preaching on the head," he said, "when a minister is seen taking a train on the Sunday morning." There was but one opinion in the Congress. A motion was carried unanimously, congratulating the people of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales on their "Sunday-Closing Acts." The Congress distinctly took up the old-fashioned position in regard to the theatre, and earnest warnings were given against the "semi-theatrical amusements which were being introduced into the drawing-room, the lecture-room, and even the church." In regard to the training of children, one of the resolutions suggested that the minister should meet the Sunday-school classes periodically and separately,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

in the same way that he meets the classes of adults, for the purpose of direct dealing with them about their spiritual state. It was suggested, too, that there should be a regular examination of all the young people above twelve, and that those who gave evidence of being regenerate should take their place at the Lord's table as professed disciples of Christ. It seemed to be felt that in the conducting of home-missions there was too much formality and stiffness. Reference was made approvingly in one of the papers to the "Salvation Army," and the great importance of its female agency. It was stated that of the 17,000 Methodist Episcopal churches in the United States, upwards of 7000 have been built within the last ten years.

One of the most noticeable things connected with the Conference is the interest which it has had for the Church of England. The *High-Church Guardian*, which is wont to assign very little space in its columns to dissenting assemblies, has given much fuller reports than are to be found in the *Nonconformist* or the *Freeman*. The *Guardian* thinks "there is little in the abstract" to forbid the re-union of Methodists to the "Church," which would give the latter "a greater play of religious emotion," and the former "a true ecclesiastical position and union with higher elements of religious thought." There is not much hope for the present, but time may bring changes, and meanwhile both parties should "study 'the things that make for peace.'" This is pretty decided wooing. But all through the Conference there was nothing to encourage such hopes and advances. "Methodism," said the reader of a paper, "has taken on Episcopacy as of human right. It denies actual succession in any form. Refusing the exclusive Presbyterian theory, it has yet developed into an economy of which *Presbyterianism is the dominant character*." "The world," said the Hon. J. W. White, "has outgrown Prelacy and Ritualism. They are the bastard offspring of Paganism and Judaism." In discussing the "Perils from Popery," the Rev. Dr. Ryckman affirmed that "the Methodists utterly reject the figment of apostolical succession, and have no faith in baptismal regeneration. The officiating minister at the Lord's table is not regarded as a priest in any sense in which the communicant is not. The paraphernalia of Ritualism—crosses, decorated altars, candles, pictures—are utterly distasteful to the Methodist people. Across the Atlantic, there is not among them a single surpliced choir, and no intoning or semi-intoning of the Psalms and lessons. No Methodist almost goes directly to Rome, but through that other Church with which we have a kind of relation."

The *Guardian* self-complacently points out that Methodism has a membership in England not a third of what it has in America. But the population of America is about double that of England, and in America there was not a great Church covering the whole land, powerful from its wealth, its social influence, its traditions, and backed by the greatest aristocracy in the world, generally in determined opposition to dissent.

CONGREGATIONALISTS.—The Congregational Union has been holding its Jubilee Meeting at Manchester. This Congress too was very successful. The number of delegates in attendance was never before so large. There were deputies in great numbers from America. The *Nonconformist* ministers of Manchester belonging to other denominations also presented a congratulation address, which was read by Mr. M'Caw, Presbyterian, and supported in a very cordial and complimentary speech by the Rev. Dr. Pope, Wesleyan.

The chairman of the year, Rev. Dr. Allon, made a long introductory address on the "Church of the Future." If we cannot agree with it altogether, if it after all throws no great light on the subject it professes to handle, it well stands comparison with anything read at Newcastle. The discussion of Mr. Martineau's recent production, which has so startled and pained many who seem to have hoped for other and better things, and the sometimes telling exhibitions of the spiritual impotence of rationalistic theology, were well-timed and useful. "Rationalism," said Dr. Allon, "wins only the suffrages of the speculative; men who seek for working power in religious life, turn away from it. We never

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

find the record in *its* history, 'the common people heard it gladly.' Intellectual power and acquirement are with it; oratory is with it; why cannot it establish itself in permanent form. Its uniform tendency is to relax the moral sanctions of life."

Dr. Hannah intimated that arrangements had been made for carrying out the resolution of last meeting of the Union in regard to the Jubilee Fund. Mr. Dale and Mr. Rogers are giving their powers of oratory to the work, and the Church is to be thoroughly visited. Already £50,000 has been contributed, chiefly in London.

ITALY.

By Rev. A. MEILLE.

CONVERSION OF CANON CAMPIELLO—THE WALDENSIAN SYNOD—DR. STEWART OF LEGHORN—DR. ROBERTSON OF EDINBURGH—MR. LAKE—M. COILLARD.

God has granted to our brethren of the Episcopal Methodist missions an important victory, at which we all rejoice. A high dignitary of the Popish Church, a member of that Roman aristocracy which till now has remained so faithful in its allegiance to the dethroned pontiff, Count Campiello, canon of St. Peter's in the Vatican, has in the most public manner abjured the errors of the Church of Rome, and joined, after a full confession of his faith, the Methodist congregation of Dr. Vernon, in Piazza Poli. There he stood up one evening last month, in the midst of the brethren, and pronounced a speech, in which he boldly declared that he renounced Romanism, to follow the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ. His abjuration was accompanied with the publication of a letter to his former superiors, in which he declared, that after having waited long under Pio IX., not to give him the grief of seeing one of the canons of St. Peter's itself leave the Church, after having vainly hoped that Leo XIII. would do something to remedy the evils under which the Church groans, he felt constrained to obey the voice of his conscience, and to declare for Christ against His pretended vicar.

It is easy to understand how such an event must have created the greatest possible sensation throughout the whole of Italy. Not a paper in any province but has announced and commented, either favourably or in a hostile spirit, on the astounding fact of a canon of the very Church of the Vatican leaving the Popish communion to join publicly, and without the smallest hindrance, the *evangelici*, the disciples of Calvin and Luther. The news has gone to every village, and cannot fail to have struck many a mind, and perhaps encouraged many a trembling and doubtful heart. Italy had seen nothing of the kind since the late Dr. Desanctis gave up, more than thirty years ago, one of the best parish churches in Rome to follow the pure Gospel. But Desanctis in those days had to steal away unperceived from Rome, and his conversion to Protestantism could be kept from his countrymen, being known only to a few. Count Campiello, on the contrary, has abjured Romanism in Rome itself, and remains there a free and undisturbed citizen. His conversion is publicly proclaimed throughout the whole peninsula. Many papers praise his courage and his disinterestedness in giving up a prebend of several thousand *scudi* a-year to follow the voice of conscience. The Italians must draw the conclusion not only that Protestant missions are at work everywhere, but that they are successful. The very priests that surround the pope, and live with him in the Vatican, are beginning to leave him. Why should not others follow the example?

Since his conversion Count Campiello has published also his own autobiography—a most interesting little book, in which we come to know that many priests in Rome itself have been for a long time of the same mind. Indeed, they went so far as to form under his leadership a kind of association intended to promote a reform in their own Church. It was discovered, of course, and very soon silenced. But may we not hope that some of the conspirators may take

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

courage and follow the example of their former chief? True, the Romish clergy are generally very timid and submissive, yet it is not to be denied that many recognise the evils and the corruptions of their own Church, and would be glad of a change if they could see their way to it. Count Campiello has shown them the way, and, although to many it may appear hard and daring to follow, I should not wonder if his noble and courageous example had a few imitators.

To some his motives for joining Protestantism may appear more of a political and patriotic than of a religious and spiritual kind. I grant that in his printed declarations there might be more of Christ and the Scriptures, and less of political complaints. But we must remember that many minds open only gradually to the full light of truth. Let us remember that Luther himself for a time only thought of the sale of indulgences, and would never have dreamed to go the length he went in his opposition to the Church of Rome. No doubt when Count Campiello comes to know the Gospel from a nearer point of view, he will find in it much more than he ever expected, and rejoice in the possession of riches which will compensate a thousandfold the valuable prebend he left behind.

I must now tell you something of our Waldensian Synod, held at the beginning of last month at Torre Pellice. It was opened as usual with the ordination of some new ministers. They were three this year—Mr. Charles Gay, Mr. Edward Zalla, and Mr. Arthur Muston. This accession brings up the total number of ministers in full service of the Waldensian Church to sixty-seven; they were sixteen only before liberty was proclaimed. No question of special importance or of an exceptional character came before this Synod, which occupied itself with a careful and exhaustive review of all the branches of the Church's activity. As far as the home Church is concerned, it was stated that some progress could be observed in the spiritual life of its members, and that in several places the Sunday was better kept, the contributions had increased, and especially the Sunday schools were more and more frequented. Still a great deal remains to be done, and nobody knows it better than the pastors themselves, who, thank God, are not only all sound in doctrine, but also remarkably full of zeal and activity.

In the mission-field, I shall not repeat the statistics given last year, contenting myself with merely saying that a few steps in advance have also been made this year. The number of communicants, of regular hearers, of Sunday-school children, and especially the contributions even of the poorest, all these things show a very encouraging and significant increase. The Churches are undoubtedly strengthening themselves, whilst here and there new ones are starting up. Of course there is as yet in Italy nothing like what the world saw in the sixteenth century—nations and their leaders turning *en masse* to the Gospel. The work, in the present political conditions of the world, must be done in other ways. It is left to the Church alone; the State remaining aloof from any religious movement whatever. Let us hope that if this state of matters gives us conversions less numerous, those it gives us are more real.

We had the pleasure this year at the Synod, of seeing many friends from abroad. One of those we can scarcely call a friend *from abroad*, although he came to us in the name of a foreign Church—our venerable benefactor, Dr. Stewart, of Leghorn. During the more than thirty years he has served the cause of Christ in Italy, he has not been absent more than three times from our Synods, and he never came but he was the bearer from his own Church and friends of some new token of Christian benevolence. He is now engaged in providing a suitable building for the Waldensian mission in Rome, a task which has been beset by untold difficulties of every kind, but which we hope our dear and valued friend will soon see completed.

Besides him, we had this year the unexpected gratification of receiving the venerable Dr. Robertson, of Greyfriars, Edinburgh. He was the bearer of the best news the Church of the valleys has heard for a long time. In 1877 he had come to La Tour, and in a stirring speech had laid on the conscience of the Vaudois to do more for their ministers, who were starving on £60 a year. He had promised

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

then, that whatever sum should be raised in the valleys, would be trebled in Scotland. He came now to say that his promise had been kept to the letter. A sum of nearly £4000 has been collected in the valleys, and £12,000 has been gathered throughout the Churches of the Presbyterian Alliance. We should have liked to see around him all the generous ladies and gentlemen who have helped him in redeeming his noble word, but to all the best thanks of the Synod were cordially voted.

It would be ungrateful on our part not to mention alongside that of Dr. Robertson the name of another friend, Mr. G. H. Lake, of Hastings, who for many years has been the untiring friend of our poorer pastors, and who was present at the Synod also. More than twenty years ago this Christian gentleman asked General Beckwith in what way he could help the Vaudois, and the General, well knowing the straitened condition of the pastors, advised him to turn his efforts towards providing some increase of salary for those that were in the most difficult circumstances. Ever since, Mr. Lake has collected amongst his friends an annual sum, which was with wise discretion distributed amongst those of our ministers whose large families made the task of meeting both ends a difficult problem to solve. At the same time Mr. Lake proved himself their friend in a thousand different ways, but this would lead me to speak of what certainly he would not like. Suffice it to say, that it was an immense pleasure to see him for the first time at one of our Synods. I may say here that by his exertions and those of the Rev. Mr. Worsfold, Rector of Haddlesley (Selby), a committee has been formed under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, for collecting in England a sum equal to that furnished by the Churches of the Presbyterian Alliance.

Do not these facts put one in mind of the times of the Commonwealth, when by order of Cromwell a collection was made in England for the poor persecuted Vaudois, and provided a sum, out of the interest of which a part of our ministers' stipends is still drawn? In the same way, from the beginning of next year our poor mountain pastors will enjoy already an increase of about the fourth part of the present stipend, owing to the liberality of their friends in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, the United States, and Australia.

I should not like to close my letter without referring to another and a most remarkable visitor we had at our Synod. I mean the Rev. Mr. Coillard, a missionary in South Africa. After many years usefully spent there in the service of the *Société des Missions de Paris*, Mr. Coillard made an excursion to the Zambesi, 1500 miles more to the north than the field in which he had worked till then, and was led to the conclusion that it was necessary to establish a missionary station on the banks of that river. To collect the necessary funds he returned to Europe, and after visiting the French Churches came to us, as he thought, for rest. But where is the deputation, either of a mission or of a Church, who can hope to find a resting-place for the soles of their feet till their work be done? This Mr. and Mrs. Coillard (the nicest Scotch lady you could wish to meet with) found amongst us. It so happened that the Vaudois have a right to consider the missions of the *Société de Paris* as somewhat their own, for it is to that Society, which counts many friends in the valleys, that we have sent, during the last fifty years, the tithe (about £50 a-year) we could spare for missions among the heathen. Except a short visit from Mr. Casalis, no missionary had ever come to us; we were therefore doubly glad to see Mr. Coillard. At an open-air meeting, after hearing him narrate in his simple but effective style the state of Africa, and the success of the missions there, it was resolved that the valleys should give this year an extraordinary subscription, equal, at least, to the ordinary yearly one. He had, therefore, to go here and there addressing meetings, and the result was that the Waldensian churches will have contributed to the Zambesi Mission a sum of above 2000 francs.

But Mr. Coillard wants more; he wants Waldensian missionaries for Africa. He pleaded for that before the Synod and before other assemblies in the most

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

moving terms. However, no Synod can give him men. God only can call missionaries, and no one would be more pleased than the Vaudois if some one of them was called by God to that distant field. And if some are called, may they be of the same type as Mr. Coillard, for if all missionaries are like him, the conquest of the world for Christ seems to me surer than ever.

THE WALDENSIAN SYNOD.

By Rev. Dr. ROBERTSON, Edinburgh.

RECEPTION OF FOREIGN DELEGATES—DR. STEWART—FRENCH AND ITALIAN LANGUAGES
—SOCIAL INTERCOURSE—M. AND MME. COILLARD—MRS. THOMPSON.

I WAS commissioned by the Scottish Section of the Continental Committee of the General Presbyterian Council to represent them at the late meeting of the Waldensian Synod, and to announce the successful issue of our endeavours to raise the sum of £12,000 in order to supplement the miserably inadequate salaries of the pastors and professors. It would have been difficult to have imposed on me any duty more congenial to my own feelings, and perhaps a short account of my visit may interest some of your readers. I arrived at Torre Pellice on Monday, the 5th September, the day on which the Synod opened, having on the day previous attended public worship in the Waldensian Church in Turin, and received the holy communion from the hands of my old friend M. Meille. The details of the business before the Synod will probably be communicated to you by one of themselves, but I must express the pleasure I derived on this and former occasions from observing the order and harmonious manner in which their proceedings were conducted. There was indeed at this time no burning question before them, but even when such does occur, I think our own Church courts might find in the bearing of the members of the Waldensian Synod towards each other something worthy of their imitation, which might help to allay the bitterness which sometimes mingles with our debates. They would indeed be more or less than human if sharp contention did not sometimes appear on keenly-contested questions, but the general courtesy and consideration for each other's feelings which prevail are worthy of no small praise.

Of the reception which I myself met with from so many dear friends I can hardly venture to speak. The expressions of affection towards myself personally, which I may be excused for saying afforded me great enjoyment, and the gratitude to the British and American Churches for the warm interest they have shown in the Church of the Valleys were, as you may well believe, not diminished by the fraternal letter from the Committee, of which I was the bearer, and the substantial proof of brotherly affection which I was commissioned to announce. But many of my friends were at pains to assure me that all this cordial greeting was not to be attributed solely to the noble gift of their Presbyterian brethren, but to the Christian love they have ever felt for Scotland, long before the Waldensian Pastors' Fund was thought of, and to this all my past intercourse with the Vaudois Church and Synod bears ample testimony.

Thursday was chiefly devoted to the public reception of foreign delegates. I was first invited to address the Synod, which I did in the French language; Dr. Stewart of Leghorn, followed in Italian; Professor Johnston of the U.P. Church, Mr. Lake of Kent, an old and valuable friend of the Vaudois, Capt. Frobisher, and Mr. Hugh Matheson in English, all admirably interpreted by Auguste Meille and others. The reception of my old and dear friend Dr. Stewart was extremely touching. When he entered the Synod the whole assembly rose to their feet, and the general manifestation of feeling reflected honour on both. Well may they honour him! Those were providential circumstances for the Vaudois Church which, nearly forty years ago, brought Dr. Stewart to settle as Free Church minister at Leghorn. His portrait hangs in the College along with

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

those of Canon Gilly and General Beckwith, and his name will be associated with theirs in Vaudois history, as in modern times the chief benefactors of the Vaudois Church. Long may his old age be solaced by the warm affection he has so nobly won.

The freedom with which French and Italian are indifferently used in the Synod is a very interesting feature of the debates, and the remarkable improvement in Italian pronunciation is deserving of great praise. Formerly the language almost universally used was French, and Italian was to them a foreign tongue. This gave a handle to their enemies to represent their mission work in Italy as a foreign invasion. It is also to be observed that there is no people so jealous of the pure utterance of their native language as the Italians, so that, in every point of view, it became a matter of the greatest importance that those whom the Church commissioned to preach the Gospel in Italy should be able to do so in a manner which neither in idiom nor in pronunciation should give suspicion of a foreign origin, or jar on the sensitive Italian ear. This has in great measure been effected, and very much, I believe, through the instructions of Signor Nicolini, the able Professor of Italian Literature. I had great pleasure in making this gentleman's acquaintance; and while conversing in private with him, his beautiful utterance of his own beautiful language (truly *lingua Toscana in bocca Romano*) sounded in my ears like very music. I was glad to observe how in the Synod Italian was gradually encroaching on the French. Most of those employed in the mission-field seemed to prefer it, and I cannot but think it very desirable that it should oust the French altogether. It was the cruel policy of Rome, through the subservient Government of Piedmont, to exclude Italian from the Waldensian pulpit and school, but the year of emancipation, 1848, restored to them the full liberty of using the language of their own country. They are Italians, and the sooner all the restrictions of an anti-Christian despotism are lost sight of the better.

During the week I spent at Torre Pellice (perhaps better known among us as La Tour), I was the guest of Professor Tron and his excellent lady, and to their truly affectionate hospitality I am indebted for much of the enjoyment of my visit. There is something exceedingly winning in the unaffected kindness of the Vaudois pastors, and in their genuine simplicity of character. Their affection is demonstrative, but there is a tone of sincerity in this demonstrativeness which utterly excludes the suspicion of mere conventional politeness. It is this which has always imparted such a charm to all my intercourse with them, and which renders the recollection of the few days I lately spent among them so very pleasing. The social intercourse I enjoyed on this occasion with M. Meille, now the aged pastor of Turin (whom I remember so far back as 1842 teaching a Sabbath school at Torre), and his accomplished family; with Lantaret, the venerated moderator; with Matteo Prochet, the eloquent President of the Evangelisation Committee; with M. Pons, the pastor of the parish, and his estimable lady; with Professor Charbonniér, and many others, has left an impression not soon to be obliterated. Nor must I omit from such agreeable recollections the pleasure I had in being welcomed once more by the widow of my old friend General Beckwith, and his sweet daughter Charlotte. A Scottish lady who lately spent a winter in the valleys wrote to me, "It is an education to live among them."

While enumerating the various friends whose society rendered my short visit so agreeable, it would be inexcusable to forget to mention that noble French missionary, François Coillard and Madame Coillard, a wife worthy of such a husband. They had withdrawn to the valleys to seek a little rest and refreshment in the midst of a life of toil and danger. They are not unknown in Edinburgh. He has lately addressed meetings here. Madame Coillard is an Edinburgh lady, and they have many personal friends among us. They expect to be here again before they return to the scene of their perilous labours. It is a privilege to know such a missionary, or rather, such missionaries, for they are

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

one in devotion to Christ's cause among the heathens. They spent four weeks in the valleys, and made a singularly deep impression, winning affection and admiration from all. His simple but stirring narrative of the toils and dangers of missionary life, in the unwholesome climates and among the ferocious tribes of Africa, was sufficient to excite a spirit of not unholy envy, and to make the work even of an Alpine pastor seem comparatively dull and monotonous.

After the reception of the foreign delegates on Thursday, a large party were entertained at dinner, when many pleasant speeches were delivered. In these the name of Mrs. Thompson was gratefully mentioned. This lady, who has shown herself so warm a friend of the Vaudois, was expected to have been present, as she had fully intended, but was prevented by indisposition from undertaking so long a journey. Her absence occasioned universal regret, and an affectionate hope was frequently expressed that on the next occasion of the meeting of Synod they might have the satisfaction of welcoming her once more among them.

On Monday, the 12th, many friends assembled to bid farewell. Many a kindly look, many a loving word, many an affectionate grasp, and so ended a week of no ordinary enjoyment.

SWITZERLAND.

THE FREE CHURCHES OF GENEVA AND OF THE CANTON DE VAUD.

By Prof. LOUIS RUFFET, D.D., Geneva.

FREE CHURCH OF GENEVA—FREE CHURCH OF CANTON DE VAUD—UNION OF
SWISS FOREIGN MISSIONS.

As we have hitherto given an account more particularly of the National Church of Geneva, and the operations of the Evangelical Society, we now turn attention to other Churches in Switzerland, and desire to present a more general view of the religious condition of the country.

The principle of the independence of the Church in relation to the State has been specially expressed in what has taken place in three of the Swiss cantons—Geneva, Vaud, and Neuchatel. In Geneva, where the ground of separation had more of a doctrinal than an ecclesiastical character, the Free Church has made little progress, and has not yet obtained a firm footing in the canton. The various attempts at evangelisation in the country districts have hitherto been comparatively devoid of results; moreover, notwithstanding its Presbyterian constitution, the Evangelical Church has, by the mere force of circumstances, continued somewhat Congregationalist. It is directed by a body of elders nominated for six years, and re-eligible. But a pretty considerable influence is exercised by the Assembly of the Church, which, though not called to vote, nevertheless expresses its views in a way intelligible enough to claim very special attention. The Evangelical Church numbers about 700 members, 200 of these being males. Worship is conducted in three chapels, those of L'Oratoire, La Rive Droite, and La Péllisserie, the first two of these being more specially employed for preaching. The sermons in the Free Church attract a pretty numerous auditory, and the pastors have a large field of labour outside the Church itself. They take part in the various evangelistic operations carried on in the city and its vicinity; one of them conducts a special home-mission agency in a necessitous district beyond the railway station, where an old brewery has been transformed into a place of worship. The work accomplished by the Evangelical Church is certainly more extensive than one might at first suppose, judging from the number of its members. Though there is now less need of courage than formerly for breaking with the National Church, a considerable amount is still necessary to do so; hence many of its members simply content themselves with enjoying the spiritual benefits generously brought before all by the Evangelical Church, without breaking connection with their own. The existence of the Free Church, however, serves to affirm in Geneva the need for a positive faith, and for union among Christians

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

in the confession of that faith. Though fiercely assailed last year on the occasion of the vote regarding the separation of the Churches from the State, her ranks have not diminished since that time; on the other hand, however, she has not been able to rejoice over the accession of those who then set forth the principle of independence as that which alone is at once Scriptural and expedient.

The Free Church of the Canton de Vaud had a different origin. In this instance there was a protest raised, not merely against infidelity or heresy within the Church, but against the action of the civil authorities, who wished to make the pulpits of the Church platforms for its political proclamations. It is quite unnecessary to recall the times when this Church was founded, and after being almost immediately baptised in the waters of persecution, received such touching sympathy and support from her sister Churches in Scotland. She now has a membership of 3840, of whom 1097 are males, and 2743 are females, formed into thirty-nine congregations. The number of adherents reaches a still higher figure. The number of communicants, however, has remained stationary for the last four years. At the close of 1880, there were 537 young people receiving instruction in the higher classes for religious training; while the income of that year amounted to 124,441 francs, and the expenditure to 122,195 francs.

A strong wind of reaction, however, is at present blowing over the Canton de Vaud. The spirit of nationalism is in the ascendant, and the editors of *The Gospel and Liberty*—MM. Narbel, D'Orbe, and Chappuis—are seeking, within the Established Church itself, to prepare the popular mind for the separation of the Church from the State. This reactionary movement cannot fail to exercise an influence on the development of the Free Church, and it is a good thing that in the midst of the agitation she succeeds in maintaining her position. Her Theological School continues to flourish; there are thirty-seven students of theology, while five attend the preparatory school. A fine tone prevails among these young men, who devote a portion of their time to Christian work. A new professor, M. Jules Bovon, entered on his duties in October last, as the successor, in the department of Dogmatic Theology, of the lamented Frederic Rambert. The study of Exegesis and Biblical Theology occupies more than half of the twenty-six hours spent each week in lectures. This fact is due to the influence of the young Professor of New Testament Exegesis, M. Charles Porret, the pupil and worthy rival of Professor Godet.

The mission conducted in South Africa by the Free Church of the Canton de Vaud has passed through a series of severe trials. Two of the missionaries, MM. Creux and Paul Berthoud, have suffered very heavily through family bereavements and from sickness. Besides the chief mission-settlement, there are now three out-stations, one of which, Barcelona, has been the most prosperous last year. The native Christians manifest great zeal in the evangelisation of their fellow-countrymen. Altogether, there are fifty-five baptised Christians, at least as many converted catechumens, and fifty children at school.

The mission of the Vaudois Church is in course of transformation, in order to become the Missionary Association of the Free Churches of Switzerland. Representatives of the Free Churches of Geneva, Neuchatel, and the Canton de Vaud recently met and agreed on a general basis for common action, pending more definite arrangements. This provisional state of matters is due to the Church of Neuchatel, which, for local reasons, wishes to maintain some of its freedom a little longer. It was feared that this new association would be prejudicial to the interests of auxiliary missionary societies in Neuchatel and Geneva; but, as might have been expected, those fears seem vain. It is probable that those Free Churches of Switzerland will ere long not only have their Home-mission operations, but a large field for Foreign missions. In this they would be following the grand and encouraging example of their sister Churches in Scotland and the United States.

TURKEY.

By Rev. ALEX. THOMSON, D.D., Constantinople.

CRETE—GREEK INTOLERANCE—WESTERN BITHYNIA—EFFECT OF THE EARTHQUAKES AT SCIO—THE SMYRNA REST.

A FEW notices of passing events may be useful in the absence of more serious intelligence, in giving some idea as to the nature of evangelistic work in Turkey.

To begin with Crete, with which my last letter was occupied,* six months after the expulsion of Klonares I determined to send to Candia a colporteur who had been there before, and who was above all others distinguished for tact, sound judgment, and success as a salesman. He went, but with some misgivings as to the motives which had actuated the adherents of Klonares, and expecting to find that Klonares had done something exceedingly imprudent, which had exasperated the people against him to such an extent. But from nobody, not even from the metropolitan, who professed great regret for the measures he had been compelled to adopt, to save, as he said, Klonares' life, did he hear a graver charge than that, when questioned by idle, ignorant fellows in the street, Klonares was ever ready to answer them, and that he attempted to preach in the street. With this exception, they admitted he was a kind and sensible man. Stepping in one day to order a pair of shoes from a shop to which he had gone three years before, he was surprised to find that a visible commotion took place all around, and he was now informed that he was in the shop of one of Klonares' disciples. But in presence of his workmen and the neighbours who crowded around, Polites (for it was he) did not dare to say a word to indicate his sentiments. But on carrying the shoes to the house, he went late at night to the colporteur, and with tears flowing down his cheeks, related to him at great length the persecution and constant alarm he and his friends had had to endure for the last six months. The colporteur knew and esteemed Polites, and was much affected by his story, and sought to comfort him with the promises and examples of the Word of God. He learned also the great personal danger through which some of the others had passed, with one of whom he met at a late hour in a retired part of the town. In short, all his doubts have vanished, and he has borne ample testimony to the intelligence, the integrity, and the silent perseverance of these afflicted brethren. One of them is a medical man; and from quite another quarter I have just learned that he waits on the poor and supplies them with medicines gratis, and that in cases of great poverty, money will often be found under the pillow of the patient after the doctor has left. The truth, even amid this fiery persecution, appears to be gaining ground, and we trust that these faithful brethren may soon be at liberty to meet for mutual edification. The Greeks boast of the unity of their Church, but a unity preserved by such means is unworthy of the name.

Another example of Greek intolerance has just occurred. Adabazar is a small town in Western Bithynia, and is noted as having been one of the first places beyond this city to make a public profession of the Gospel; for a Protestant Armenian community has existed there for thirty-five years. Upon the Greek population of the town the movement among the Armenians produced little effect for a long time. About twenty years ago, however, a number of Greeks embraced Protestant views, and took some steps to join their Armenian brethren; but this movement was crushed out by the sheer, unrestrained violence of certain rich and influential Greeks in the town, and the intending Protestants were compelled to hold their views in secret, while professing adherence to a Church whose corruptions they well understood.

In prosecution of my duty, I had occasion to send a colporteur into Western Bithynia, and selected a Turkish-speaking Greek of about thirty years of age, and directed him to settle with his family at Adabazar. It so happened that just before his arrival one of the Greeks had ventured to attend Protestant worship, and gave every indication of sincerity; and hence it was thought desir-

* See *The Catholic Presbyterian* for May, 1881, page 393.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

able that the colporteur, as a Greek, should hire rooms in this person's house. This was done. But it has been followed up by a series of outrages both to person and property, such as breaking of windows, beating and mobbing the inmates, with all sort of abusive and disgusting language, so that both the colporteur and the proprietor of the house himself have been compelled to seek refuge elsewhere in the Armenian quarter. On the last occasion the house was robbed, and the family of the colporteur exposed to great personal danger, while the Greek priest openly encouraged the rioters. The Turkish governor, on being applied to, dismissed the colporteur with the remark, "Unless you had been a bad man you would never have changed your religion." The Armenian Protestants, with their worthy pastor, Rev. A. Djezizian, have done all in their power to aid these sufferers, but in vain. A report of the case has now been sent to the British Embassy.

I might illustrate the ignorance, suspicion, and arbitrary cruelty, that mark a great deal of the Government procedure at the present time, by relating how a colporteur fared on proceeding along the railway from Uscup in Northern Macedonia to Pristina in Albania. Though his books had been most carefully examined over and over again, both before he started and on arriving at his destination, he was ultimately detained at Pristina about a month under arrest, and then sent back to Uscup under a guard, his family meanwhile having been alarmed by officers coming at midnight and sealing up every apartment in the house but one, under pretence that he was a vender of seditious books. This conduct would seem to have been the result of either ignorance or fanaticism; as the charge brought against the colporteur was, that he sold the Christian Scriptures in the Turkish language—a thing that has been done daily in the streets of the capital for the last twenty years. Certain it is, however, that until something efficient shall be done for the Albanians in the west and for the Koords in the east, missionary work will be obstructed in the most distressing manner. In self-defence, aggressive missionary work among these people is urgently required.

But though work in this empire is still in many cases a hard struggle, it is not entirely so. The earthquakes at Scio, of which all must have heard, gave occasion to a large distribution of the Word of God to the islanders, by the British and Foreign Bible Society, which was received with the utmost gratitude by all classes of the population. The larger books—Bibles, and Testaments, in both the ancient and modern languages—were chiefly reserved for priests and schoolmasters, merchants, and people of good education; and it was delightful to find that they accepted them joyfully, without one word of complaint that the version was unauthorised, or that the books had no cross on them either outside or inside, and had no pictures of the saints. May the Lord grant His blessing to the Word thus widely scattered.

Klonares, formerly of Crete, is now successfully at work in South-West Asia Minor, and especially at Adalia among the Turkish-speaking Greeks. We have also been much interested in the Second Report of the Smyrna Rest, which has just appeared, and which describes one of the most interesting Christian agencies in Smyrna. Having visited the "Rest" a few months ago, we can cordially commend the institution to the sympathy of all our fellow-Christians. Its success among the Greeks, through the preaching of Rev. G. Constantine, is quite remarkable.

THE BOHEMIAN COMMEMORATION.

THE Commemoration of the Centenary of Toleration took place at Klobouk, in Moravia, on the 20th September, and at Prague, in Bohemia, on the 13th October. Many deputies from other churches took part in the celebration. In our next number a full account will be given of these interesting celebrations, and of the impressions produced on the delegates as to the state of the Bohemian Church, and the best ways of helping it.

OPEN COUNCIL.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATUS OF THE MEDICAL
MISSIONARY.

RECENT years have witnessed a remarkable progress in the cause of Medical Missions. Forty years ago, when the society which represents it was founded in Edinburgh, the conception of it, although already carried into practical effect to some extent by the Americans, was almost unknown in this country; and those of us who have here watched its history can bear testimony to the tardy growth which has characterised it, until within a very recent period. This is not the opportunity for estimating in detail the various agencies and events which, in the providence of God, have brought about this very notable change, this remarkable efflorescence, so to speak, of the last few years. To the few survivors who remember the small beginning of the society, and the long years during which there was a continuous call for faith and patience and hope—hope almost against hope—the splendid development now witnessed seems to raise several questions that demand serious, deliberate, prayerful consideration.

1. The great meeting held on the evening of 3rd June, 1881, in the Hall of the United Presbyterian Synod, at which more than two thousand persons were present, while the platform was crowded with representative men of all evangelical denominations, amply confirmed all that we have said. It was a devotional, farewell service in connection with the simultaneous departure of no fewer than eight young medical men for various foreign fields of missionary labour, men thoroughly educated in their profession, specially trained for evangelistic work, and likely, if they had chosen otherwise, to be successful practitioners in surgery and medicine at home. The whole aspect of such an occasion is expressive of power from above, of faith, of human energy and hopefulness, and indicates, we humbly believe, that the Divine favour is resting upon a missionary *method*, which, although comparatively new and partially developed in these modern times, was actually exhibited in perfection, both by the Divine Master Himself and by His immediate followers, in accordance with His still unrepealed injunction—"Heal the sick, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." Without seeking to undervalue, in the smallest degree, the time-honoured methods pursued in other forms of missionary enterprise, we may ask a question fairly suggested by the evidence now submitted as to the recent progress of the Medical Mission principle. Seeing that this principle has not only much to recommend it, but, somehow or other, has really come to the front, is it not both a reasonable and a desirable thing that it should now be cordially recognised by the various Evangelical Churches as an indispensable element in all their future arrangements? They are becoming familiar with the conception that a medical missionary is a useful addition to every station, both to watch over the health of the other missionaries and of their families, and also as fitted to help in conciliating the natives and commending the Gospel to their acceptance, by the temporal benefits conveyed in healing the sick and mitigating suffering; but we doubt much if there are many influential Church members who are adequately impressed with the conviction that an accomplished medical missionary—that is to say, a man thoroughly reliable as a surgeon, and, at the same time, wise to win souls to Christ—is rightfully entitled to a front place in all fields of missionary enterprise.

2. We are now prepared to put a second question—Will it not be a seemly and a wise thing, in the near future, for the Christian Church to assign to men such as those we are speaking of some officially recognised position to which they shall be

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

formally and solemnly *set apart*? Hitherto, unless the medical missionary should happen also to have passed through a *curriculum* of theological study, with a view to ultimate license as a preacher, he can look for no special encouragement in the way of recognition from the Church to which he belongs, but must be content with an outside farewell-meeting like that one to which we have already referred. Such an occasion is, of course, pleasant and strengthening; but we hold that something more is required, and that the Church falls short of her duty if her sons are suffered to leave our shores on a service so honourable and important, without being specially set apart for it. The proceeding need not receive the name of ordination, although really analogous to it. The order of lay evangelists is not unknown in the Presbyterian Church, and we can see no valid objection to recognising an order of *medical evangelists*, who, after due inquiry and examination of a tender and sympathetic nature, may be sent forth with the *imprimatur* of their Church.

3. But it will be asked—and not unreasonably—Why should any such innovation be required? Let the medical student, who aspires to be a missionary, study theology in the regular course, with a view to license, and in his case the difficulty will be overcome. This view requires to be carefully considered and disposed of.

We frankly concede that there have been, that there are, exceptional cases in which the medical student has also passed through the *curriculum* of theology, and has eventually shown himself to be an excellent medical missionary. Such individuals, however, are rarely met with, and it will be found that, generally speaking, they have been licentiates of certain Nonconformist Churches, which do not require so elaborate, so full, so prolonged a course of study as is now deemed essential by the leading branches of Presbyterianism. (And, of course, it is with the last that we are mainly concerned, when occupying the pages of *The Catholic Presbyterian*.)

We have no hesitation in asserting (and in this we express the opinion of the Medical Missionary Society) that, as a rule, the study of medicine in these days embraces so many and such engrossing topics as to be quite incompatible with the scientific study of theology, if the two are to be carried on simultaneously. It is impossible for the ordinary run of men to prosecute both studies with advantage. They will turn out to be neither good surgeons nor good theologians. The proposal cannot be entertained. A medical missionary must be thoroughly educated and trained in his profession, if he is to accomplish the work to which he is sent in an efficient, creditable manner; and we ought to be thankful and contented if, in addition, he can speak from the heart to the heart when commending to his fellow-sinners “the unsearchable riches of Christ.” This is what we aim at in the Medical Missionary Training Institution.

But it will be asked, Can he not go through the two *curricula* at different times, if not simultaneously? There are obvious objections to such an arrangement. When a man has obtained his diploma as a surgeon, after four or five years of anxious and arduous devotion to the manifold subjects involved *now* in a medical course of study, will he have any heart for commencing the no less arduous topics of the Divinity Hall? And if he does address himself to them manfully, where will be his surgery, where will be his knowledge of minute anatomy at the end of four other toilsome years? Again, if he takes theology in the first instance, his mind will have lost, we fear, in most cases, the youthful freshness and the needful aptitude for pursuits so totally new and dissimilar. The idea of combining the two professions must, for the sake of future efficiency, be abandoned.

4. Medical missionaries, as most people know, have been very useful as *pioneers*, when associated with naval men, with skilled artisans, and with other persons of an enterprising, handy turn, who, animated by the love of Christ, are eminently suited to conciliate heathen tribes by familiarising them with the arts and social advantages of civilised life. Such companies of useful and devoted men have, in some instances, because of pecuniary and other reasons, been for a time

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1881.]

unattended by any clerical missionary. They were *pioneers*, and the time had not come for a minister being advantageously added to their number. In that case, great efforts have been sometimes made to procure a medical missionary who had either gone through a theological *curriculum*, or who, by unwonted exertions, might be decently got ready for entering the ecclesiastical portals of the Church. We do not deny the possibility of getting a good and tolerably efficient man under the stress and strain of such an emergency. But we aver, that unless the proper remedy be found, great mistakes may yet be made, while a continuous discouragement is unavoidably presented to the cause of Medical Missions. On a recent occasion, two able and effective students of the Society, members of the Free Church of Scotland, were counted *ineligible* for filling an appointment in the Livingstonia Mission in Southern Africa, because they were not ordained men; and, therefore, could not dispense the sacrament, on occasion, in that heathen sphere of labour.

Let all medical missionaries, as we have suggested, be set apart by the Churches as medical evangelists; and to meet the few cases in which sealing ordinances may be needed, let the evangelist be authorised by the Church to dispense them in that region where he labours, and in it alone. If an ordained missionary be subsequently sent out to join him, let his authorisation come to an end; or if he leaves the scene of his work and returns home, let the same result take place. He is henceforth to perform the functions of an ordained man—unless sanctioned anew by the Church—in no other sphere than that to which he was originally sent.

We have much satisfaction in referring to an editorial article in the "Quarterly Paper" of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society of February, 1881, in which this subject is ably treated.

BENJ. BELL, F.R.C.S.E.

EDINBURGH.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Church Systems in the Nineteenth Century. By J. Guinness Rogers, B.A. Hodder & Stoughton.

The Resurrection of Our Lord. By William Milligan, D.D. Macmillan & Co.

Christ Lifted Up. By Rev. R. Gilchrist. Morgan & Scott.

The Domestic Circle. By John Thomson, D.D., Paisley. Johnstone, Hunter, & Co.

The Last Supper of Our Lord. By J. M. Lang, D.D. Macniven & Wallace.

Christianity, Science, and Infidelity. By Dr. Hillier. R. D. Dickinson.

The Homiletic Quarterly, October, 1881. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

Christologie des Alten Testaments. Von Dr. Eduard Böhl, Wien, Braumüller.

Johannes a Lasco. Von Hermann Dalton. Gotha, Perthes.

The Divine Ideal of the Church. London, Stock.

Memorials of Bishop M'Ilvaine. By Rev. W. Carver. London, Stock.

The Acts and Epistles of St. Paul. By Rev. F. A. Malleson, M.A. Hodder & Stoughton.

Christian Sociology. By J. H. W. Stuckenborg, D.D. London, Dickinson.

Old Testament History of Redemption. By F. Delitzsch. Edinburgh, Clark.

Arkite Worship. By Rev. R. Balgarnie. London, Nisbet.

Scotch Communion Services. By Rev. Wm. Milroy, A.B. Paisley, Gardner.

The Biblical Museum, Old Testament, Vol. X. London, Stock.

Le Nouveau Testament. Traduction Nouvelle. London, Stock.

Le Voyage du Chrétien. Par J. Bunyan. London, Stock.

Thirza. By Elizabeth Marie Lloyd. London, Stock.